arXiv:hep-th/9204034v1 14 Apr 1992

A CONTINUUM DESCRIPTION OF \ SUPER-CALOGERO MODELS \

André Johann van Tonder

Department of Physics, University of the Witwatersrand
PO WITS 2050, South Africa

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Science, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

CNLS-91-01

March 1992

Bitnet address: 005CNLS@witsvma.wits.ac.za

ABSTRACT

In this thesis an investigation is made of the super-Calogero model with particular emphasis on its continuum formulation and possible application in the context of supersymmetrizing the bosonic collective $d = 1$ string field theory.

We start with a discussion of the model both in a discrete and continuum formulation, demonstrating its equivalence to the Marinari-Parisi supersymmetric matrix model and the Jevicki-Rodrigues supersymmetrized collective field theory. Upon quantization, the continuum fields are found to have nontrivial commutation relations involving square roots of the density field, leading to an infinite sequence of higher order vertices in the perturbative Hamiltonian as well as the supersymmetry generators.

We then discuss the potential free case, with an explicit calculation of the spectrum and the cubic vertices. After comparing a particular spacetime formulation of the theory with gauge fixed two-dimensional supergravity, the exact spectrum, as previously obtained in the bosonic collective field theory, is generalised to the supersymmetric case. In addition to this, a formulation is postulated in which to investigate nonperturbative effects such as solitons in a semiclassical analysis.

For the harmonic case, the semiclassical spectrum and cubic vertices are then calculated, an undertaking that turns out to be very sensitive to the method of regularization. If one wants to preserve supersymmetry, it seems that one cannot generate a bosonic sector compatible with the bosonic collective string field theory.

We then move on to more general potentials. After discussing the semiclassical spectrum, we conclude with an investigation of the scaling properties of the superpotentials and the possibility of a spacetime interpretation of the theory. It is argued that the scaling poperties of the vacuum configuration correspond to that found in zero-dimensional $c < 1$ models, in contrast to the $c = 1$ behaviour of the bosonic collective field theory.

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own, unaided work. It is being submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination at any other University.

_____
André van Tonder

_____ day of _____, 1992

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to João Rodrigues for his excellent supervision of my work and many discussions. I would also like to express my gratitude to the theory group at Brown University for their hospitality during a visit of mine in the final months of my doctorate, and to thank Antal Jevicki, Branislav Sazdović, Krešimir Demeterfi, Katsumi Itoh and Branko Urošević for stimulating discussions on matters related to this work.

Ek wil ook my opregte waardering uitspreek teenoor my gesin, op wie se liefdevolle ondersteuning ek altyd kan staat maak.

CONTENTS

Chapter one. 7

Introduction

Chapter two. 9

The Supersymmetric Model

2.1. Motivation 9

2.2. The super-Calogero model 10

2.3. Continuum description 12

2.4. Supersymmetrized collective field model 14

2.5. Supersymmetric matrix model 18

2.6. Explicit N-dependence 22

Chapter three. 25

Perturbation Theory

Chapter four. 31

The Potential Free Case

4.1. Motivation 31

4.2. The vacuum density 31

4.3. Perturbative expansion 35

4.4. Comparison with supergravity 37

4.5. Exact nonperturbative results 43

4.6. Alternative representation of exact states 44

4.7. Semiclassical analysis 47

Chapter five. 50

The Harmonic Case

5.1. Motivation 50

5.2. The vacuum density 50

5.3. The quadratic spectrum 52

5.4. Three point functions 55

5.5. Turning point divergences 58

Chapter six. 64

General Potential

6.1. Semiclassical spectrum 64

6.2. Scaling limit 70

Chapter seven. 75

Conclusions

References. 77

1. INTRODUCTION

From a continuum description of the eigenvalue dynamics of matrix models [1], the collective field method has emerged as a field theory of one dimensional bosonic strings [2] and has provided much insight into their physics.

At the same time, the fact that the eigenvalue dynamics is described by an exactly solvable N-particle model of a type that was extensively studied by Calogero and Perelomov [34] in the sixties and seventies has proven very useful in the formulation and resolution of issues of symmetry and integrability, both in the discrete and in the collective field language [4].

All indications are that the collective string field theory is a complete theory, in that perturbative calculations [6, 7] are in agreement with matrix model [8], first quantized [9] and exact fermionic [10, 11] calculations.

It is therefore of great interest to develop a field theory of $d = 1$ superstrings.

The study of non critical superstrings [12] has centered, essentially, on two approaches: one is based on super Liouville, first quantized calculations, first for $d < 1$ [14] and recently for the $d = 1$ superstring [15] and the other is based on the supersymmetrization of the eigenvalue dynamics of matrix models. The latter has been done both in the discrete language [13] and directly in the continuum, by supersymmetrizing the bosonic collective field theory [16].

In both approaches one encounters problems of interpretation. In the Liouville language it is unclear whether spacetime supersymmetry exists. In the matrix model the spacetime interpretation itself is problematic and it is not known at present whether one is indeed describing a theory of one dimensional superstrings.

While the bosonic matrix model corresponds to the exactly solvable Calogero model, its supersymmetrization corresponds to the super-Calogero model as introduced in reference [23], or a suitable continuum approximation of it.

It is the purpose of this thesis to study the super-Calogero model with particular emphasis on its continuum formulation and possible application in the context

of supersymmetrizing the bosonic collective $d = 1$ string field theory.

The text is organized as follows. In chapter 2, after a brief historical introduction, we give the continuum formulation of the super-Calogero model and show its equivalence to both the Marinari-Parisi supermatrix model and the Jevicki-Rodrigues supersymmetric collective field theory. In chapter 3 we set up the perturbation theory for a general superpotential. In chapter 4 we specialize to the potential free case and extend some exact nonperturbative results from the bosonic collective field theory to the supersymmetric case. In chapter 5 we discuss the case of a harmonic superpotential, with special reference to issues of regularization. In chapter 6 we return to the general potential with a discussion of the spectrum and the scaling limit. The last chapter is reserved for conclusions and outlook.

2. THE SUPERSYMMETRIC MODEL

2.1. Motivation

The bosonic Calogero model was first studied as an example of an exactly solvable N-particle quantum mechanical system by Calogero and Perelomov [34] in the sixties and seventies. Its Hamiltonian in the centre of mass frame of reference is given by

$$H_B = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i^2 + V_B(x_1, \ldots, x_N), \tag{2.1}$$

where the potential V_B is chosen to be

$$V_B(x_1, \ldots, x_N) = \frac{\omega^2}{2}\sum_i x_i^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\sum_{i\neq j}\frac{1}{(x_i - x_j)^2}. \tag{2.2}$$

We see that the potential consists of a harmonic piece as well as a term describing a repulsive interparticle force.

It has been known for some time [8, 18] that at the quantum level the dynamics of the singlet sector of certain one dimensional matrix models are described by systems of Calogero type. Indeed, when one quantizes the singlet sector, parametrized by the eigenvalues, of an $SU(N)$ invariant matrix model, there appears a Jacobian that can be reinterpreted as an effective interaction between the eigenvalues. This effective interaction is identical to the singular term in (2.2).

Even at the classical level one can obtain this effective repulsive interaction by imposing specific constraints on the conserved angular momenta corresponding to the $SU(N)$ symmetry. This fact was noted in [21] in the context of describing the planar limit of quantized matrix models.

Recently systems of Calogero type have attracted renewed interest due to the fact that they appear in the matrix model approach to one-dimensional bosonic quantum string field theory. A stringy continuum limit is obtained via a double

scaling in which one essentially replaces the harmonic part of the potential (2.2) with an inverted harmonic interaction, letting $N \to \infty$ while the fermi level is taken to approach the maximum of the inverted potential.

There have been attempts, initiated by Marinari and Parisi [13], to define a supersymmetric string field theory in one dimension via a matrix model formulated in a $(1,1)$-dimensional superspace. On the other hand, existing results for the Calogero system have been extended by Freedman and Mende to its natural supersymmetrization, to be discussed in the next section. This super-Calogero system is essentially equivalent to the Marinari-Parisi matrix model, as we shall demonstrate in section (2.5).

A collective field description of the matrix model formulation of $d = 1$ bosonic string theory was given for the first time by Das and Jevicki in [2]. In this approach, the string field theory was seen to correspond to a cubic field theory of a massless tachyon particle in two dimensions. This bosonic collective field theory was supersymmetrized by Jevicki and Rodrigues in [16] for the noninverted harmonic oscillator. As we shall see in section (2.4), the resulting theory is equivalent to the super-Calogero model in a continuum formulation to be established in section (2.3).

2.2. The super-Calogero model

The supersymmetric generalization of the Calogero model was first investigated by Freedman and Mende in [23]. For completeness, we repeat their construction here. Using the approach of Witten [29] one introduces, in addition to the bosonic coordinates x_i, the fermionic coordinates ψ_i and $\psi_i^\dagger$ satisfying the standard anti-commutation relations $\{\psi_i, \psi_j\} = 0$, $\{\psi_i^\dagger, \psi_j^\dagger\} = 0$ and $\{\psi_i, \psi_j^\dagger\} = \delta_{ij}$. One then defines supercharges in terms of a so-called superpotential $W(x_i, \ldots, x_N)$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q &\equiv \sum_i \psi_i^\dagger \left(p_i - i \, \frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i} \right), \\
Q^\dagger &\equiv \sum_i \psi_i \left(p_i + i \, \frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i} \right)
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.3}
$$

satisfying $\{Q, Q\} = 0 = \{Q^\dagger, Q^\dagger\}$. The Hamiltonian is constructed as

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_S &\equiv \frac{1}{2}\{Q, Q^\dagger\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \left(p_i^2 + \left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i} \right)^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} [\psi_i^\dagger, \psi_j] \, \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.4}
$$

and commutes with Q and $Q^\dagger$.

Choosing, for example,

$$
W(x_1, \ldots, x_N) = \frac{\omega}{2} \sum_i x_i^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \log |x_i - x_j|, \tag{2.5}
$$

one finds, after some algebra [23],

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_S = & \frac{1}{2} \sum_i p_i^2 + \frac{\omega^2}{2} \sum_i x_i^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{1}{(x_i - x_j)^2} \\
& + \omega \sum_i \psi_i^\dagger \psi_i - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} [\psi_i^\dagger - \psi_j^\dagger, \psi_i] \, \frac{1}{(x_i - x_j)^2} \\
& - \frac{\omega}{2} \, (1 - \varepsilon N)(N - 1).
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.6}
$$

The bosonic part of this supersymmetric Hamiltonian coincides, apart from an additive constant, with the original Calogero model (2.1) and (2.2).

The model (2.6) has the same form as the one studied by Freedman and Mende in the centre of mass frame of reference. However, their coordinates are centre of

mass coordinates and therefore satisfy the constraints

$$\sum_i x_i = \sum_i p_i = \sum_i \psi_i^\dagger = \sum_i \psi_i = 0,$$

which are second class and modify the canonical brackets. However, as we are interested in the correspondence of the above system with matrix models we shall ignore the constraints and assume standard commutators.

This concludes the discussion of the supersymmetric generalization of the Calogero model. We now move on to a formulation of the model in terms of continuum fields.

2.3. Continuum description

We now follow the lead of [21] and [16] to set up a continuum approximation of the discrete model (2.3) and (2.4). This approximation is assumed to become exact in the limit $N \to \infty$, where the discrete distribution x_i will approximate a continuous density. With this in mind, we introduce the continuum index x and define the fields

$$\phi(x) \equiv \partial_x \varphi \equiv \sum_i \delta(x - x_i), \qquad \phi\sigma(x) \equiv -\sum_i \delta(x - x_i)\, p_i,$$

$$\psi(x) = -\sum_i \delta(x - x_i)\, \psi_i, \qquad \psi^\dagger(x) = -\sum_i \delta(x - x_i)\, \psi_i^\dagger. \tag{2.7}$$

These fields satisfy commutation relations

$$\begin{aligned} [\sigma(x), \varphi(y)] &= -i\, \delta(x - y), \\ [\sigma(x), \psi^\dagger(y)] &= i\, \frac{\psi^\dagger}{\phi}(x)\, \partial_x \delta(x - y), \\ [\sigma(x), \psi(y)] &= i\, \frac{\psi}{\phi}(x)\, \partial_x \delta(x - y), \\ \{\psi(x), \psi^\dagger(y)\} &= \phi(x)\, \delta(x - y). \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

These equalities are easily proved using the identity

$$\delta(x - x_i) f(x) = \delta(x - x_i) f(x_i), \tag{2.9}$$

where f is an arbitrary function.

Let us now rewrite the Calogero supercharges (2.3) in terms of the continuum fields. At the classical level, using $\int dx\, \delta(x - x_i)\, \delta(x - x_j)/\phi(x) = \delta_{ij}$, which can be established via (2.9), and the fact that by the chain rule $\partial W/\partial x_i = \delta W/\delta\varphi(x_i)$, it is easy to show that the supercharges can equivalently be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \int dx\, \psi^\dagger(x)\, (\sigma(x) - i\, W_{;x}), \\ Q^\dagger &= \int dx\, \psi(x)\, (\sigma(x) + i\, W_{;x}), \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where we have used the notation $W_{;x} \equiv \delta W/\delta\varphi(x)$.

In a careful quantum mechanical treatment of bosonic matrix models, additional terms arise in the corresponding continuum Hamiltonian [1, 37]. However, leaving out these terms, perturbative calculations of scattering amplitudes [15] reproduce exactly those obtained in the continuum approach. In the free potential case [17] an exact solution exhibits two single particle branches, one of which can always be described semiclassically by the inclusion of the extra terms. We assume that a similar mechanism would apply here and postulate (2.10) to be the full quantum mechanical supercharges.

To find the equivalent expression for the Hamiltonian (2.4) in terms of the continuum fields, we can take advantage of the fact that the corresponding supercharges are equivalent and use (2.10) to construct the continuum Hamiltonian. We find, using $H = \frac{1}{2}\{Q, Q^\dagger\}$, that

$$\begin{aligned} H = {} & \frac{1}{2} \int dx\, \phi\, \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int dx\, \phi\, (W_{;x})^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{dx}{\phi}\, [\psi^\dagger, \psi]\, \partial_x W_{;x} + \frac{1}{2} \int dx \int dy\, [\psi^\dagger(x), \psi(y)]\, W_{;xy}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

From the definition of the field ϕ, we see that the continuum Hamiltonian must be

accompanied by the constraint

$$\int dx\, \phi(x) = N.$$

To summarise, in this section we have set up a continuum formulation of the super-Calogero model, based on approximating discrete eigenvalue densities by continuous functions. This approximation is expected to become exact once a suitable $N \to \infty$ limit is taken. We now have a language in which to compare the Calogero model with the Jevicki-Rodrigues supersymmetrization of the bosonic collective field theory, which we do in the next section.

2.4. Supersymmetrized collective field model

In [16] a supersymmetric extension of the bosonic collective field theory was described. This was done by noting that the collective field theory can be seen as a metric theory, which can be supersymmetrized via a standard procedure.

To see how this works, observe that the kinetic term of the bosonic collective Lagrangian

$$L = \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\,\dot{\varphi}^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{6}\int dx\,\phi^3 - \int dx\, v\phi \tag{2.12}$$

can be written in the form

$$L_T = \frac{1}{2}\int dx \int dy\, \dot{\varphi}(x,t)\, g_{xy}\, \dot{\varphi}(y,t),$$

where the continuous index metric is given by

$$g_{xy}(\varphi) = \frac{1}{\phi(x)}\,\delta(x-y). \tag{2.13}$$

A standard supersymmetrization of a theory of this type is given by

$$\begin{aligned} L = {} & \frac{1}{2}(\dot{q}^a g_{ab}\,\dot{q}^b - g^{ab}\,\partial_a W\,\partial_b W) + i\,\psi^{\dagger a} g_{ab}\,\dot{\psi}^b \\ & + i\,\psi^{\dagger a}\Gamma_{bc,a}\,\dot{q}^c\psi^b + \frac{1}{2}\,[\psi^{\dagger c},\psi^d]\,\Gamma^a_{cd}\,\partial_a W - \frac{1}{2}\,[\psi^{\dagger a},\psi^b]\,\partial_a\partial_b W, \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

where q^a are the bosonic variables, g_{ab} is a metric, W is a superpotential and Γ^c_{ab} are

the Christoffel symbols. This can be obtained by a classical point transformation $x^i \equiv x^i(q^a)$, $\psi^i = (\partial x^i/\partial q^a)\psi^a \equiv e^i_a \psi^a$ from the Lagrangian

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{2}\dot{x}_i^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\partial_i W)^2 \right) + i \sum_{i=1}^{N} \psi_i^\dagger \dot{\psi}_i - \sum_{ij} [\psi_i^\dagger, \psi_j]\, \partial_i \partial_j W,$$

which is a multidimensional generalization of one-dimensional supersymmetric quantum mechanics [29].

Note the expressions of the form $\frac{1}{2}[\psi^\dagger, \psi]$ here. Classically, taking ϕ and $\phi^\dagger$ to be Grassman variables, we have the identity $\frac{1}{2}[\psi^\dagger, \psi] = \psi^\dagger \psi$. At the quantum level, however, this replacement would destroy supersymmetry unless an additional term were added to the bosonic potential in (2.14). Thus (2.14) is the proper Lagrangian to use for quantization.

In our case the q^a are replaced by $\varphi(x)$ and g_{xy} is given by (2.13). One obtains the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} L = {} & \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\, \dot{\varphi}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int dx\, \phi\, (W_{;x})^2 \\ & + i \int \frac{dx}{\phi}\, \psi^\dagger \dot{\psi} + i \int \frac{dx}{\phi}\, \dot{\varphi}\, \partial_x \left(\frac{\psi^\dagger}{\phi} \right) \psi \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\, [\psi^\dagger, \psi]\, \partial_x W_{;x} - \frac{1}{2}\int dx \int dy\, [\psi^\dagger(x), \psi(y)]\, W_{;xy}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

This is equivalent, via a partial integration, to

$$\begin{aligned} L = {} & \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\, \dot{\varphi}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int dx\, \phi\, (W_{;x})^2 \\ & + \frac{i}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\, (\psi^\dagger \dot{\psi} - \dot{\psi}^\dagger \psi) + \frac{i}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\, \dot{\varphi} \left[\partial_x \left(\frac{\psi^\dagger}{\phi} \right) \psi - \psi^\dagger \partial_x \left(\frac{\psi}{\phi} \right) \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\, [\psi^\dagger, \psi]\, \partial_x W_{;x} - \frac{1}{2}\int dx \int dy\, [\psi^\dagger(x), \psi(y)]\, W_{;xy}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

Our motivation for this rewriting is that in the form (2.16) the momentum conjugate to the field φ is manifestly hermitian, while in (2.15) it is nonhermitian.

Even so, one would like the respective theories to be equivalent at the quantum level. Though it would take us too far afield to show it here, this indeed turns out to be the case: in both cases we can define a hermitian σ which satisfies the commutation relations (2.8) and in terms of which the Hamiltonian can be written in the form (2.11).

The conjugate momenta are given by

$$p(x) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\varphi}} = \frac{\dot{\varphi}}{\phi} + \frac{i}{2}\left[\partial_x\left(\frac{\psi^\dagger}{\phi}\right)\frac{\psi}{\phi} - \frac{\psi^\dagger}{\phi}\partial_x\left(\frac{\psi}{\phi}\right)\right], \tag{2.17}$$

$$\Pi = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\psi}} = \frac{i}{2}\frac{\psi^\dagger}{\phi}, \qquad \Pi^\dagger = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\psi}^\dagger} = -\frac{i}{2}\frac{\psi}{\phi}. \tag{2.18}$$

Identifying the second class constraints

$$\begin{aligned} \chi &= \Pi - \frac{i}{2}\frac{\psi^\dagger}{\phi}, \\ \bar{\chi} &= \Pi^\dagger + \frac{i}{2}\frac{\psi}{\phi}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

one uses Dirac brackets [16, 26] to obtain the following equal time brackets

$$[\varphi(x), \varphi(y)] = 0, \quad [\varphi(x), p(y)] = i\delta(x-y), \quad \{\psi(x), \psi^\dagger(y)\} = \phi(x)\delta(x-y), \tag{2.20}$$

$$[\varphi(x), \psi(y)] = [\varphi(x), \psi^\dagger(y)] = 0, \tag{2.21}$$

$$[\,p(x), \psi(y)] = \frac{i}{2}\frac{\psi(y)}{\phi(y)}\,\partial_x\delta(x-y), \quad [\,p(x), \psi^\dagger(y)] = \frac{i}{2}\frac{\psi^\dagger(y)}{\phi(y)}\,\partial_x\delta(x-y). \tag{2.22}$$

In terms of

$$\sigma(x) \equiv p(x) - \frac{i}{2}\left[\partial_x\left(\frac{\psi^\dagger}{\phi}\right)\frac{\psi}{\phi} - \frac{\psi^\dagger}{\phi}\partial_x\left(\frac{\psi}{\phi}\right)\right] \tag{2.23}$$

the Hamiltonian then takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} H = & \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,\sigma\phi\sigma + \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,\phi\,(W_{;x})^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\,[\psi^\dagger,\psi]\,\partial_x W_{;x} + \frac{1}{2}\int dx \int dy\,[\psi^\dagger(x),\psi(y)]\,W_{;xy}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

while from equations (2.20), (2.22) and (2.23) it follows that

$$[\sigma(x),\psi(y)] = i\,\frac{\psi}{\phi}(x)\,\partial_x\delta(x-y), \qquad [\sigma(x),\psi^\dagger(y)] = i\,\frac{\psi^\dagger}{\phi}(x)\,\partial_x\delta(x-y). \tag{2.25}$$

The collective field ϕ satisfies the constraint

$$\int dx\,\phi(x) = N.$$

This Hamiltonian and these commutation relations are identical with those derived in the continuum description of the super-Calogero model in (2.8) and (2.11).

What is unusual about the commutations (2.25) is of course the fact that the bosonic momentum does not commute with the fermionic fields. We observe that from (2.20) and (2.22) we have

$$\left[p(x),\frac{\psi(y)}{\sqrt{\phi(y)}}\right] = 0, \qquad \left[p(x),\frac{\psi^\dagger(y)}{\sqrt{\phi(y)}}\right] = 0. \tag{2.26}$$

We therefore rescale $\psi(x) \to \sqrt{\phi(x)}\,\psi(x)$; $\psi^\dagger(x) \to \sqrt{\phi(x)}\,\psi^\dagger(x)$ to obtain for the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} L = & \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\,\dot\varphi^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,\phi\,(W_{;x})^2 \\ & + \frac{i}{2}\int dx\,(\psi^\dagger\dot\psi - \dot\psi^\dagger\psi) + \frac{i}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\,\dot\varphi\left[\partial_x\psi^\dagger\psi - \psi^\dagger\partial_x\psi\right] \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,[\psi^\dagger,\psi]\,\partial_x W_{;x} - \frac{1}{2}\int dx\int dy\,[\psi^\dagger(x),\psi(y)]\sqrt{\phi(x)}\,W_{;xy}\,\sqrt{\phi(y)}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

for the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H = & \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\,\left(\phi p - \frac{i}{2}\left[(\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi)\right]\right)^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,\phi\,(W_{;x})^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,[\psi^\dagger,\psi]\,\partial_x W_{;x} \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\int dx \int dy\,[\psi^\dagger(x),\psi(y)]\sqrt{\phi(x)}\,W_{;xy}\,\sqrt{\phi(y)}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

and for the supercharges

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \int dx\,\psi^\dagger(x)\sqrt{\phi(x)}\,\left(p(x) - \frac{i}{2\phi}\left((\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi)\right) - i\,W_{;x}\right), \\ Q^\dagger &= \int dx\,\psi(x)\sqrt{\phi(x)}\,\left(p(x) - \frac{i}{2\phi}\left((\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi)\right) + i\,W_{;x}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

with standard commutators

$$[\varphi(x),\varphi(y)] = 0, \quad [\varphi(x),p(y)] = i\,\delta(x-y), \quad \{\psi(x),\psi^\dagger(y)\} = \delta(x-y),$$

$$[\varphi(x),\psi(y)] = [\varphi(x),\psi^\dagger(y)] = [\,p(x),\psi(y)] = [\,p(x),\psi^\dagger(y)] = 0. \tag{2.30}$$

The square root factors appearing in equations (2.27) to (2.29), when expanded around the large N background configuration, will generate an infinite perturbative expansion.

To summarise, in this section we showed this approach to supersymmetrizing the bosonic collective field theory to be a special case of the super-Calogero model in the continuum formulation. In the next section we shall establish the correspondence of the super-Calogero model with the supersymmetric matrix model.

2.5. Supersymmetric matrix model

In this section we will demonstrate the equivalence of the Marinari-Parisi supersymmetric matrix model [13] to the super-Calogero model of section (2.2). Our analysis is based on that of Dabholkar in [13].

Consider a theory of $N \times N$ hermitean matrices on a $(1,1)$-dimensional superspace with action

$$S = \int dt\, d\theta\, d\bar{\theta}\, \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{Tr}\, \left(\bar{D}\Phi\, D\Phi \right) + \bar{W}(\Phi) \right). \tag{2.31}$$

Here $D \equiv \partial_{\bar{\theta}} - i\,\theta\,\partial_t$, and we can expand Φ as

$$\Phi \equiv M + \Psi^\dagger \theta + \bar{\theta}\Psi + \bar{\theta}\theta F, \tag{2.32}$$

where M and F are hermitean, and where we have used the conventions $(\alpha\beta)^* = \beta^*\alpha^*$ and $(\partial_{\bar{\theta}})^* = -\partial_\theta$.

The Feynman diagrams of a matrix theory can be topologically classified according to the genus. If one takes $\bar{W}$ to be of the form

$$\bar{W}(\Phi) = \mathrm{Tr} \left(g_2\, \Phi^2 + \frac{g_3}{\sqrt{N}}\, \Phi^3 + \cdots + \frac{g_p}{N^{p/2-1}}\, \Phi^p \right), \tag{2.33}$$

then by a simple topological argument [8] it follows that a diagram of genus Γ carries a factor $N^{2-2\Gamma}$ and can therefore naively be interpreted as a supertriangulation of the corresponding diagram in the perturbation expansion of a string theory with coupling constant $1/N^2$.

Upon quantization one finds the Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\, \mathrm{Tr} \left(P^2 + \frac{\partial \bar{W}(M)}{\partial M^*}\, \frac{\partial \bar{W}(M)}{\partial M} \right) + \sum_{ijkl} [\Psi^*_{ji}, \Psi_{kl}]\, \frac{\partial \bar{W}(M)}{\partial M^*_{ij}\, \partial M_{kl}}, \tag{2.34}$$

and supercharges

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q &= \sum_{ij} \Psi^*_{ij} \left(P^*_{ij} - i \, \frac{\partial \bar{W}(M)}{\partial M^*_{ij}} \right), \\
Q^\dagger &= \sum_{ij} \Psi_{ij} \left(P_{ij} + i \, \frac{\partial \bar{W}(M)}{\partial M_{ij}} \right),
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.35}
$$

where $[P_{ij}, M_{kl}] = -i \, \delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}$ and $\{\Psi_{ij}, \Psi_{kl}\} = \delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}$.

In the bosonic matrix model one observes at this point that the model is invariant under unitary transformations, which implies that one can restrict the theory to the invariant subspace consisting of those wavefunctions that only depend on the eigenvalues.

An analogous procedure can be followed in the supersymmetric case: Let U be the unitary transformation that diagonalizes the bosonic component M of the matrix Φ. In general the fermionic components Ψ and $\Psi^\dagger$ of Φ will not be diagonalized by U. Nevertheless, writing the diagonal elements as

$$
(U \Phi U^\dagger)_{ii} \equiv \lambda_i + \bar{\theta} \, \psi_i + \psi_i^\dagger \, \theta + \bar{\theta}\theta f_i, \tag{2.36}
$$

we shall see that we can define an invariant subspace consisting of those wave functions that depend only on $(\lambda, \psi^\dagger)$. Therefore it will make sense to restrict the theory to this subspace.

Changing variables from M_{ij} to the N eigenvalues λ_i and the $N(N-1)/2$ angular variables on which U depends, one gets the decomposition (see Dabholkar [13])

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial M_{ij}} = \sum_m U^\dagger_{jm} U_{mi} \, \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_m} + \sum_{k \neq l} \frac{U_{ki} U^\dagger_{jl} \, \tilde{A}_{kl}}{(\lambda_k - \lambda_l)}, \tag{2.37}
$$

where the angular derivative $\tilde{A}_{kl}$ is defined by $\tilde{A}_{kl} \equiv \sum_m U_{lm} \, \partial / \partial U_{km}$.

In terms of the new variables the supercharges (2.35) become

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \sum_m \hat{\Psi}^*_{mm} \left(-i \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_m} - i \frac{\partial \bar{W}(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_m} \right) - i \sum_{k \neq l} \frac{\hat{\Psi}^*_{kl} \tilde{A}^*_{kl}}{(\lambda_k - \lambda_l)}, \\ Q^\dagger &= \sum_m \hat{\Psi}_{mm} \left(-i \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_m} + i \frac{\partial \bar{W}(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_m} \right) - i \sum_{k \neq l} \frac{\hat{\Psi}_{kl} \tilde{A}_{kl}}{(\lambda_k - \lambda_l)}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.38}$$

where $\hat{\Psi} \equiv U \Psi U^\dagger$. Using $\hat{\Psi}_{mm} = \psi_m$, one can write a wave function depending only on $(\lambda, \psi^\dagger)$ as

$$\phi(\lambda, \psi^\dagger) \equiv f(\lambda) \prod_k \psi^\dagger_{m_k} |0\rangle = f(\lambda) \prod_k \hat{\Psi}^*_{m_k m_k} |0\rangle. \tag{2.39}$$

With a little patience one can now show that the subspace of such wavefunctions is indeed invariant under the action of the supercharges (2.38) and that in the subspace the supercharges reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \sum_i \psi^\dagger_i \left(-i \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_i} - i \frac{\partial \bar{W}(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_i} \right), \\ \bar{Q} &= \sum_i \psi_i \left(-i \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_i} + i \frac{\partial \bar{W}(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_i} - 2i \sum_{l<i} \frac{1}{\lambda_i - \lambda_l} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.40}$$

At first glance these expressions may seem inconsistent in that $\bar{Q}$ appears to have lost its property of conjugacy to Q. This paradox is resolved by the observation that Q and $\bar{Q}$ are indeed hermitean conjugates with respect to the inner product on the original Hilbert space. The original inner product reduces to a nontrivial inner product on the subspace.

To see how this works, let us review the analysis of Jevicki and Sakita [1], modified here to include fermionic degrees of freedom. Take ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 to be of the

form (2.39). The inner product on the original Hilbert space can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\phi_1|\phi_2\rangle &= \int (dM)(d\Psi^\dagger)(d\Psi)\, e^{-\mathrm{Tr}(\Psi^\dagger\Psi)}\phi_1^*(\lambda,\psi)\,\phi_2(\lambda,\psi^\dagger) \\ &= \int (d\lambda)(d\hat{\Psi}^\dagger)(d\hat{\Psi})\, e^{-\mathrm{Tr}(\hat{\Psi}^\dagger\hat{\Psi})} J(\lambda)\,\phi_1^*(\lambda,\psi)\,\phi_2(\lambda,\psi^\dagger) \\ &= \int (d\lambda)(d\psi^\dagger)(d\psi)\, e^{-\psi^\dagger\psi} J(\lambda)\,\phi_1^*(\lambda,\psi)\,\phi_2(\lambda,\psi^\dagger),\end{aligned} \tag{2.41}$$

where $dM = \prod_i dM_{ii} \prod_{j>i} dM_{ij}\, d\bar{M}_{ij}$ integrates over the independent degrees of freedom of a hermitean matrix only and where we have used the fact that the fermionic measure $\exp[-\mathrm{Tr}(\Psi^\dagger\Psi)]$ is invariant under $\Phi \to U\Phi U^\dagger$ (this measure has to be included when one writes the fermionic part of the inner product as a Berezinian integral [27]).

One sees that the inner product in (2.41) differs from the trivial inner product on the subspace in that one has to include the measure $J(\lambda)$. In general, this measure is given by the integral over the spurious degrees of freedom of the Jacobian associated to the change of variables.

If we now rescale the wave functions as $\phi \to J^{1/2}\phi$, we can use the trivial inner product on the subspace provided we rescale the momenta as $p_i \to J^{1/2}\, p_i\, J^{-1/2} = p_i + \frac{i}{2}\,\partial(\ln J)/\partial\lambda_i$.

Applying this transformation to the supercharges (2.40) we find

$$\begin{aligned} Q &\to \sum_i \psi_i^\dagger \left(-i\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_i} + \frac{1}{2}\,i\,\frac{\partial \ln J}{\partial\lambda_i} - i\,\frac{\partial\bar{W}(\lambda)}{\partial\lambda_i}\right), \\ \bar{Q} &\to \sum_i \psi_i \left(-i\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_i} + \frac{1}{2}\,i\,\frac{\partial \ln J}{\partial\lambda_i} + i\,\frac{\partial\bar{W}(\lambda)}{\partial\lambda_i} - 2i\sum_{l<i}\frac{1}{\lambda_i-\lambda_l}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.42}$$

The most efficient way to solve for J is simply to use the fact that now $\bar{Q}^\dagger = Q$ with respect to the trivial inner product in the subspace. We find

$$\frac{\partial \ln J}{\partial\lambda_i} = 2\sum_{l<i}\frac{1}{\lambda_i-\lambda_l}, \tag{2.43}$$

and we get an effective theory with trivial inner product and supercharges

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \sum_i \psi_i^\dagger \left(p_i - i \, \frac{\partial W(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_i} \right), \\ Q^\dagger &= \sum_i \psi_i \left(p_i + i \, \frac{\partial W(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_i} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.44}$$

where the effective potential W is given by

$$W = \bar{W} - \sum_{l<k} \ln(\lambda_k - \lambda_l). \tag{2.45}$$

We therefore see that the supersymmetric matrix model, restricted to a suitable supersymmetric generalization of the singlet subspace, has the form of the super-Calogero model, thus completing the chain of equivalences between the Calogero model, the supersymmetrized collective field theory and the supersymmetric matrix model.

2.6. Explicit N-dependence

We now move on to a discussion of the N-scaling of the various terms in the theory.

Let us consider a general effective superpotential of the form

$$W = \int dx \, \bar{W}(x) \, \partial_x \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \int dx \int dy \, \ln|x-y| \, \partial_x \varphi \, \partial_y \varphi. \tag{2.46}$$

For the special case $\bar{W}(x) = \frac{\omega}{2} x^2$, this is just a rewriting in terms of the continuum fields (2.7) of the harmonic plus repulsive superpotential (2.5) of the super-Calogero model. In general $\bar{W}$ will depend on N as in (2.33).

Defining $\tilde{v}(x) \equiv \bar{W}'(x)$, the supercharges (2.29) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q &\equiv \int dx\, \psi^\dagger(x)\sqrt{\phi(x)}\left(p(x) - \frac{i}{2\phi}\left((\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi)\right)\right. \\ &\quad \left. + i\,\tilde{v}(x) - i\fint dy\,\frac{\partial_y\varphi}{x-y}\right), \\ Q^\dagger &\equiv \int dx\, \psi(x)\sqrt{\phi(x)}\left(p(x) - \frac{i}{2\phi}\left((\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi)\right)\right. \\ &\quad \left. - i\,\tilde{v}(x) + i\fint dy\,\frac{\partial_y\varphi}{x-y}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.47}$$

and the Hamiltonian (2.28) is

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\,\left(\phi p - \frac{i}{2}\left[(\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi)\right]\right)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,\phi(x)\left(\fint dy\,\frac{\partial_y\varphi}{x-y} - \tilde{v}(x)\right)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,[\psi^\dagger,\psi]\,\frac{d}{dx}\left(\fint dy\,\frac{\partial_y\varphi}{x-y} - \tilde{v}(x)\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\int dx\left[\psi^\dagger(x)\sqrt{\phi(x)}, \frac{d}{dx}\fint dy\,\frac{\psi(y)\sqrt{\phi(y)}}{x-y}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.48}$$

This Hamiltonian and these supercharges depend implicitly on N through v and the constraint $\int\phi = N$. To make the N-dependence explicit, observe that for W of the form (2.33) the expressions $\tilde{v}(\sqrt{N}x)/\sqrt{N}$ and $\tilde{v}'(\sqrt{N}x)$ are independent of N. We are therefore motivated to rescale $x \to \sqrt{N}x$. Then to get rid of the N-dependence in the constraint, we must rescale $\phi \to \sqrt{N}\phi$.

The complete rescaling is given by $x \to \sqrt{N}\,x$, $\phi \to \sqrt{N}\,\phi$, $\varphi \to N\varphi$, $p \to p/N^{3/2}$ and $\psi^{(\dagger)} \to \psi^{(\dagger)}/N^{1/4}$. Defining $v(x) \equiv \tilde{v}(\sqrt{N}x)/\sqrt{N}$, which is *independent*

of N, we get for the supercharges

$$\begin{aligned} Q \equiv & \int dx\, \psi^\dagger(x)\sqrt{\phi(x)}\left(\frac{p(x)}{N} - \frac{i}{2\phi N}\Big((\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi)\Big)\right. \\ & \left. + i\,N\,v(x) - iN\fint dy\,\frac{\partial_y\varphi}{x-y}\right), \\ Q^\dagger \equiv & \int dx\, \psi(x)\sqrt{\phi(x)}\left(\frac{p(x)}{N} - \frac{i}{2\phi N}\Big((\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi)\Big)\right. \\ & \left. - i\,N\,v(x) + iN\fint dy\,\frac{\partial_y\varphi}{x-y}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.49}$$

and for the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H = & \frac{1}{2N^2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\,\left(\phi p - \frac{i}{2}\Big[(\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi)\Big]\right)^2 \\ & + \frac{N^2}{2}\int dx\,\phi(x)\left(\fint dy\,\frac{\partial_y\varphi}{x-y} - v(x)\right)^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,[\psi^\dagger,\psi]\,\frac{d}{dx}\left(\fint dy\,\frac{\partial_y\varphi}{x-y} - v(x)\right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\int dx\left[\psi^\dagger(x)\sqrt{\phi(x)}, \frac{d}{dx}\fint dy\,\frac{\psi(y)\sqrt{\phi(y)}}{x-y}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.50}$$

The rescaled collective field satisfies the constraint

$$\int dx\,\phi(x) = 1, \tag{2.51}$$

and we can therefore conclude that the Hamiltonian (2.50) has no remaining implicit dependence on N.

This concludes our general introduction to the continuum formulation of the super-Calogero model. In the next chapter we move on to a discussion of the perturbation theory of this model.

3. PERTURBATION THEORY

In this chapter we write down the general perturbation theory of the supersymmetric model given an arbitrary potential. We show that an infinite sequence of higher order interactions is generated, in contrast to the bosonic collective field theory, where there are only cubic interactions.

The Hamiltonian (2.50) of our theory was found to be

$$\begin{aligned} H = & \frac{1}{2N^2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\,\left(\phi p - \frac{i}{2}\left[(\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi)\right]\right)^2 \\ & + \frac{N^2}{2}\int dx\,\phi(x)\left(-\!\!\!\!\!\!\int dy\,\frac{\partial_y\varphi}{x-y} - v(x)\right)^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,[\psi^\dagger,\psi]\,\frac{d}{dx}\left(-\!\!\!\!\!\!\int dy\,\frac{\partial_y\varphi}{x-y} - v(x)\right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\int dx\left[\psi^\dagger(x)\sqrt{\phi(x)}, \frac{d}{dx}-\!\!\!\!\!\!\int dy\,\frac{\psi(y)\sqrt{\phi(y)}}{x-y}\right], \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

with the constraint $\int \phi = 1$.

Let ϕ_0 be an extremum of the bosonic potential subject to the above constraint (we do not assume supersymmetry to be unbroken) and expand around this vacuum configuration as

$$\phi = \partial_x\varphi = \phi_0 + \frac{1}{N}\,\partial_x\eta, \qquad p \to Np. \tag{3.2}$$

The factor $1/N$ makes all bosonic propagators of order unity in position space, and absorbs the explicit N-dependence into the vertices. This is purely a matter of convenience, and the factor $1/N$ could be left out without changing the theory, a fact that can be seen by power counting of graphs in position space, or most simply by writing the respective Hamiltonians in terms of normalized creation and destruction operators and noting that the resulting expressions are identical.

Expanding about ϕ_0, terms linear in $\partial\eta$ cancel and the Hamiltonian (3.1)

becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
H = & \frac{N^2}{2}\int dx\,\phi_0(x)\left(\fint dy\,\frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} - v(x)\right)^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,\phi_0 p^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{2}\int dx\,\phi_0(\partial_x\eta)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int dx \fint dy\,\frac{v(x)-v(y)}{x-y}\,\partial_x\eta\,\partial_y\eta \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,\left[\psi^\dagger(x)\sqrt{\phi_0(x)}, \frac{d}{dx}\fint dy\,\frac{\psi(y)\sqrt{\phi_0(y)}}{x-y}\right] \\
& - \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,[\psi^\dagger(x),\psi(x)]\,\frac{d}{dx}\left(\fint dy\,\frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} - v(x)\right) \\
& + \frac{1}{2N}\int dx\,(\partial_x\eta)\,p^2 + \frac{1}{2N}\int dx\,\partial_x\eta\left(\fint dy\,\frac{\partial_y\eta}{x-y}\right)^2 \\
& - \frac{i}{2N}\int dx\,\left[(\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi)\right]p \\
& - \frac{1}{2N}\int dx\,[\psi^\dagger(x),\psi(x)]\,\frac{d}{dx}\fint dy\,\frac{\partial_y\eta}{x-y} \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,\left[\psi^\dagger(x)\sqrt{\phi_0(x)}\left(\sqrt{\phi/\phi_0}(x)-1\right), \frac{d}{dx}\fint dy\,\frac{\psi(y)\sqrt{\phi_0(y)}}{x-y}\right] \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,\left[\psi^\dagger(x)\sqrt{\phi_0(x)}, \frac{d}{dx}\fint dy\,\frac{\psi(y)\sqrt{\phi_0(y)}}{x-y}\left(\sqrt{\phi/\phi_0}(y)-1\right)\right] \\
& + \frac{1}{8N^2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi_0+\frac{1}{N}\partial_x\eta}\,\left[\psi(\partial_x\psi^\dagger)(\partial_x\psi)\psi^\dagger + \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi)(\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi\right] \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,\Bigg[\psi^\dagger(x)\sqrt{\phi_0(x)}\left(\sqrt{\phi/\phi_0}(x)-1\right), \\
& \quad \frac{d}{dx}\fint dy\,\frac{\psi(y)\sqrt{\phi_0(y)}}{x-y}\left(\sqrt{\phi/\phi_0}(y)-1\right)\Bigg].
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.3}
$$

Some remarks are in order at this point: In the bosonic collective field theory, cubic terms such as appear in the bosonic part of the Hamiltonian (3.1) are simplified using the identity

$$
\int dx\,\phi(x)\left(\fint dy\,\frac{\phi(y)}{x-y}\right)^2 = \frac{\pi^2}{3}\int dx\,\phi^3(x), \tag{3.4}
$$

which can readily be demonstrated [17] in Fourier space using

$$\fint dy \, \frac{e^{iky}}{x-y} = -\pi i \, \epsilon(k) \, e^{ikx}. \tag{3.5}$$

In applying (3.4) one must, however, be careful. Obviously as it stands it cannot be valid if the integral $\int \phi^3$ on the right hand side diverges. This can indeed happen, both at the level of the vacuum density ϕ_0, as we shall see in the potential free case (chapter 4) and at the level of the fluctuations $\partial\eta$, as we shall see in the harmonic case (chapter 5). To be general, we therefore *avoid* using the identity (3.4) in this chapter, and treat issues of regularization later, as they arise.

On the other hand, in (3.3) we have rewritten the quadratic terms by applying the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \int dx \, \phi_0(x) \left(\fint dy \, \frac{\partial_y \eta}{x-y} \right)^2 + 2 \int dx \, \partial_x \eta \left(\fint dy \, \frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} \right) \left(\fint dz \, \frac{\partial_z \eta}{x-z} \right) \\ = \pi^2 \int dx \, \phi_0 (\partial_x \eta)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

which is easy to show in Fourier space. For all the cases that we will consider, the integrals in (3.6) are well behaved and no special regularizations are needed.

The first term in the Hamiltonian (3.3) is just a constant. If it is nonzero, then supersymmetry is broken to leading order in N. Conversely, if the vacuum configuration of the density field satisfies

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\phi_0) = \frac{N^2}{2} \int dx \, \phi_0(x) \left(\fint dy \, \frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} - v(x) \right)^2 = 0. \tag{3.7}$$

then supersymmetry is preserved to leading order. This will be the case if

$$\fint dy \, \frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} - v(x) = 0. \tag{3.8}$$

Restricting attention to the bosonic piece, in addition to the terms associated in the bosonic string theory [2] to a massless scalar particle, one has the additional

contribution

$$-\frac{1}{2}\int dx \fint dy\, \frac{v(x)-v(y)}{x-y}\,\partial_x\eta\,\partial_y\eta,$$

which may in general affect the dynamics in unexpected ways. However, using the fact that $\int dx\,\partial_x\eta = 0$, it is easy to show that for potentials of the general form $v(x) = a + bx + cx^2$, this term falls away and the quadratic spectrum is that of a massless scalar. These potentials include the free case, the harmonic case, and the Marinari-Parisi potential [13, 32].

Using

$$\sqrt{\phi/\phi_0} - 1 = \frac{1}{2N\phi_0}\,\partial_x\eta - \frac{1}{8N^2\phi_0^2}\,(\partial_x\eta)^2 + o\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right), \tag{3.9}$$

the Hamiltonian can be written up to cubic order as

$$\begin{aligned}
H = {} & \frac{N^2}{2}\int dx\,\phi_0(x)\left(\fint dy\,\frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} - v(x)\right)^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,\phi_0 p^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{2}\int dx\,\phi_0(\partial_x\eta)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int dx \fint dy\,\frac{v(x)-v(y)}{x-y}\,\partial_x\eta\,\partial_y\eta \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,\left[\psi^\dagger(x)\sqrt{\phi_0(x)}, \frac{d}{dx}\fint dy\,\frac{\psi(y)\sqrt{\phi_0(y)}}{x-y}\right] \\
& - \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,[\psi^\dagger(x),\psi(x)]\,\frac{d}{dx}\left(\fint dy\,\frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} - v(x)\right) \\
& + \frac{1}{2N}\int dx\,(\partial_x\eta)\,p^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{6N}\int dx\,(\partial_x\eta)^3 - \frac{i}{2N}\int dx\,\left[(\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi)\right]p \\
& - \frac{1}{2N}\int dx\,[\psi^\dagger(x),\psi(x)]\,\frac{d}{dx}\fint dy\,\frac{\partial_y\eta}{x-y} \\
& + \frac{1}{4N}\int dx\,\left[\frac{\psi^\dagger(x)}{\sqrt{\phi_0(x)}}\,\partial_x\eta, \frac{d}{dx}\fint dy\,\frac{\psi(y)\sqrt{\phi_0(y)}}{x-y}\right] \\
& + \frac{1}{4N}\int dx\,\left[\psi^\dagger(x)\sqrt{\phi_0(x)}, \frac{d}{dx}\fint dy\,\frac{\psi(y)/\sqrt{\phi_0(y)}}{x-y}\,\partial_y\eta\right] + o\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

and the supercharges (2.49) can be written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q = & \int dx\, \sqrt{\phi_0}\, \psi^\dagger(x) \sqrt{\phi/\phi_0} \left\{ p(x) - i \fint dy\, \frac{\partial_y \eta}{x-y} \right. \\
& - iN \left(\fint dy\, \frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} - v(x) \right) \\
& \left. - \frac{i}{2N\phi_0(1+\frac{1}{N\phi_0}\partial_x\eta)} \Big((\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi) \Big) \right\} \\
= & -iN \int dx\, \sqrt{\phi_0}\, \psi^\dagger \left(\fint dy\, \frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} - v(x) \right) \\
& + \int dx\, \sqrt{\phi_0}\, \psi^\dagger(x) \left\{ p(x) - i \fint dy\, \frac{\partial_y \eta}{x-y} \right. \\
& \left. - \frac{i}{2\phi_0}\, \partial_x \eta \left(\fint dy\, \frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} - v(x) \right) \right\} \\
& + \frac{1}{2N} \int \frac{dx}{\sqrt{\phi_0}}\, \psi^\dagger(x) \left\{ \partial_x \eta \left[p(x) - i \fint dy\, \frac{\partial_y \eta}{x-y} \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + \frac{i}{4\phi_0}\, \partial_x \eta \left(\fint dy\, \frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} - v(x) \right) \right] \right. \\
& \left. - i \Big((\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi) \Big) \right\} + o\left(\frac{1}{N^2} \right), \\
Q^\dagger = & \text{ h.c..}
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.11}
$$

We see that the system develops an infinite sequence of polynomial interactions in the bare string coupling constant $1/N^2$. This is in contrast to the cubic bosonic collective field theory Hamiltonian [2, 6, 7] and does not depend on the presence of a potential v. The supercharges also acquire expansions to all orders in perturbation theory, typical of supersymmetric theories expanded about background configurations. In general, we expect the presence of a nontrivial background ϕ_0 to "dress" the coupling constant and allow us to take a suitable double scaling limit.

One of the remarkable properties of the cubic bosonic Hamiltonian is that [7] the integral representation of a given amplitude can in general be reinterpreted as a sum of standard tachyon interchange diagrams, plus contact terms, in a one to one correspondence to first quantized Liouville computations [9]. In studies of

critical closed string field theory, an infinite sequence of polynomial interactions seems to be required to obtain agreement with the first quantized integrations over moduli space [36]. In the model discussed in this thesis, the need to also include an infinite sequence of vertices is unavoidable. It should be clear that the reason for the supersymmetrized version of the simple bosonic cubic Hamiltonian to contain an infinite sequence of higher order vertices with derivative couplings is that the supercharges themselves have an infinite perturbative expansion.

It is conceivable that other supersymmetric extensions of the bosonic collective string field Hamiltonian (possibly formulated directly in the continuum) may exist, with properties different from those described here. Ultimately, once a genuine field theory of $d = 1$ superstrings is formulated, the correct choice would be selected by requiring agreement with the super-Liouville theory [15].

After an analysis of the free and the harmonic theories in chapters 4 and 5, we shall return to the general potential case in chapter 6.

4. THE POTENTIAL FREE CASE

4.1. Motivation

In this chapter we specialize the discussion to the potential free case characterised by $v(x) = 0$.

One reason for studying this case is the following: we saw in the previous chapter that any nontrivial potential generates a nontrivial perturbative background. In the bosonic case it is well known that the inverted harmonic oscillator potential is associated with $d = 1$ strings. By starting with the theory without a potential term, however, in the bosonic case one can obtain an inverted harmonic oscillator potential by means of a simultaneous field transformation and coordinate reparametrization [16]. The potential free case therefore corresponds to a background independent formulation of the theory.

Also, the bosonic potential free model has been solved exactly [16] and stringy semiclassical solutions have been described. Some of these results turn out to be easily generalizable to the supersymmetric case, as we now demonstrate.

4.2. The vacuum density

As a first step, we discuss the extremization of the potential. In the process we shall see that to make the free theory well defined, one needs to introduce a regularization, a fact that was already alluded to in the previous chapter.

The potential term of the Hamitonian (3.1) is given in the free case by

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\phi) = \frac{N^2}{2} \int dx\, \phi(x) \left(\fint dy\, \frac{\phi(y)}{x-y} \right)^2 , \tag{4.1}$$

As we noted in the previous chapter, for supersymmetry to be unbroken to leading order in N, the vacuum density ϕ_0 must satisfy

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\phi_0) = 0. \tag{4.2}$$

Alternatively, one may try to obtain ϕ_0 by applying the identity (3.4) to rewrite

the potential (4.1) as a local expression in ϕ and then extremizing with respect to ϕ. However, in the free case the integral $\int \phi^3$ will in general diverge and has to be regulated. To see why, note that on physical grounds one expects the density of eigenvalues to be constant, in which case equation (4.2) follows from the result

$$\fint \frac{dy}{x-y} = 0. \tag{4.3}$$

For a constant ϕ_0 the integral $\int \phi_0^3$ does not converge and the identity (3.4) becomes invalid. In addition to this, the vacuum density cannot consistently be normalized so as to satisfy the constraint $\int \phi_0 = 1$.

To overcome these problems, we can regulate the system by putting it in a box of length L and imposing periodic boundary conditions. More precisely, we restrict the original theory to the subspace of all states $|\Psi\rangle$ such that $\phi(x)|\Psi\rangle = \phi(x+L)|\Psi\rangle$. For this restriction to be consistent, the periodic subspace must be invariant under the supercharges. To see that this is indeed the case, note that for states $|\Psi\rangle$ satisfying the above periodicity condition we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\fint_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \, \frac{\phi(y)}{x-y}|\Psi\rangle &= \sum_n \fint_{-L/2}^{L/2} dy \, \frac{\phi(y)}{x-y+nL}|\Psi\rangle \\
&= \fint_{-L/2}^{L/2} dy \, \phi(y) \sum_n \frac{1}{x-y+nL}|\Psi\rangle \\
&= \fint_{-L/2}^{L/2} dy \, \phi(y) \, \frac{\pi}{L} \, \cot\left[\frac{(x-y)\pi}{L}\right]|\Psi\rangle,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

where we have used the identity $\sum_n \frac{1}{x+n\pi} = \cot x$, which is almost trivial to see by comparing pole structures.

Using (4.4), the supercharge Q in (2.49) becomes, on the periodic subspace,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q &\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \, \psi^\dagger \sqrt{\phi} \left(\frac{\sigma}{N} + i\, N\, v - i\, N \fint_{-L/2}^{L/2} dy \, \phi(y) \, \frac{\pi}{L} \, \cot\left[\frac{(x-y)\pi}{L}\right] \right) \\
&= \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} dx \, \psi^\dagger \sqrt{\phi} \left(\frac{\sigma}{N} + i\, N\, v - i\, N \fint_{-L/2}^{L/2} dy \, \phi(y) \, \frac{\pi}{L} \, \cot\left[\frac{(x-y)\pi}{L}\right] \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

up to an infinite constant, provided the potential v has been chosen to be periodic. Due to the fact that $\cot(\pi x/L)$ has period L, we see that the periodic subspace is indeed invariant under Q, and that we can restrict to the interval $[-L/2, L/2]$ provided we change the kernel

$$\frac{1}{x-y} \to \frac{\pi}{L}\cot\left[\frac{(x-y)\pi}{L}\right]. \tag{4.6}$$

Not suprisingly, this kernel is the one that appears in quantized matrix models of unitary matrices. The reason for this is that when one restricts the original theory with (Fourier space) collective variables $\phi_k = \mathrm{Tr}\left(e^{ikM}\right)$ to the periodic subspace, the collective variables in the subspace are those of a theory of unitary matrices: they are given by $\phi_n = \mathrm{Tr}\,(U^n)$, where the unitary matrix $U \equiv e^{2\pi i M/L}$.

Henceforth we shall interpret the kernel

$$(K\phi)(x) = \fint dy\, \frac{\phi(y)}{x-y}$$

as the limit as $L \to \infty$ of

$$(K'\phi)(x) = \fint dy\, \phi(y)\frac{\pi}{L}\cot\left[\frac{(x-y)\pi}{L}\right]. \tag{4.7}$$

In this sense, the equation (4.3) remains true in a box of finite length L, and the identity that should replace (3.4) is given by

$$\int dx\, \phi(x)\left(\fint dy\, \frac{\phi(y)}{x-y}\right)^2 = \frac{\pi^2}{3}\int dx\, \phi^3(x) - \frac{\pi^2}{3L^2}\left(\int dx\, \phi(x)\right)^3. \tag{4.8}$$

This can be shown in Fourier space, the second term arising from a careful treatment of the zero mode. The same result was proven by analytical methods in [19]. For a density ϕ that is normalisable independently of L, the second term vanishes in the limit $L \to \infty$, which is consistent with the original identity (3.4). However, in the example of the free case the vacuum density is constant and should be normalised as $\phi_0 = 1/L$, and we see that both terms on the right hand side of (4.8) are of order $1/L^2$.

The second term on the right hand side of (4.8) is commonly dropped in the bosonic $d = 1$ string, as it only shifts the value of the energy by a constant value (the energy of an ensemble of $\int dx\, \phi(x)$ free fermions in a box of length L). In the supersymmetric formalism, however, we cannot consistently leave it out.

Using the identity (4.8), we find

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\phi) = \frac{N^2\pi^2}{6} \int dx\, \phi^3(x) - \frac{N^2\pi^2}{6L^2} \left(\int dx\, \phi(x) \right)^3 . \tag{4.9}$$

The background ϕ_0 satisfies the stationarity condition

$$\frac{\pi^2\phi_0^2}{2} - \frac{\pi^2}{2L^2} \left(\int dx\, \phi_0(x) \right)^2 = 0. \tag{4.10}$$

Requiring $\int \phi_0 = 1$, we find $\phi_0 = 1/L$.

Comparing this with the bosonic case, where a constant background ϕ_0 results from an effective potential

$$V_B(\phi) = N^2 \left[\frac{\pi^2}{6} \int dx\, \phi^3(x) - \mu_F \int dx\, \phi(x) \right] \tag{4.11}$$

for which the stationarity condition yields

$$\frac{\pi^2}{2}\phi^2 - \mu_F = 0, \tag{4.12}$$

one sees that in equation (4.10) one can identify

$$\mu_F \equiv \frac{\pi^2}{2L^2} \left(\int dx\, \phi(x) \right)^2 .$$

This μ_F is the fermi energy one would expect for a system of $\int dx\, \phi(x)$ one dimensional free particles. In this sense the chemical potential can be said to be "dynamically induced" in the supersymmetric system.

Using $\phi_0 = 1/L$, we immediately find that $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi_0) = 0$, so that supersymmetry is unbroken to leading order.

To summarize, due to the fact that in the free case the potential is unbounded, we needed to introduce a periodic regularization to make the theory well-defined. Such a regularization changes the identity (3.4) to give (4.8).

Having found the vacuum density, we can now expand about it to find the effective perturbation theory for the fluctuations, which will be done in the next section.

4.3. Perturbative expansion

We are now ready to specialize the general perturbative expansion of the previous chapter to the free case.

Applying the identity (4.8) to the fluctuations $\partial\eta$ and using the fact that, due to the constraint $\int \partial\eta = 0$, the Hamiltonian (3.10) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} H = {} & \frac{\phi_0}{2} \int dx\, p^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{2} \int dx\, (\partial_x \eta)^2 + \frac{\phi_0}{2} \int dx \, \left[\psi^\dagger(x), \frac{d}{dx} \fint dy \, \frac{\psi(y)}{x-y} \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{2N} \int dx\, (\partial_x \eta)\, p^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{6N} \int dx\, (\partial_x \eta)^3 - \frac{i}{2N} \int dx \, \left[(\partial_x \psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger (\partial_x \psi) \right] p \\ & - \frac{1}{2N} \int dx \, \left[\psi^\dagger(x), \psi(x) \frac{d}{dx} \fint dy \, \frac{\partial_y \eta}{x-y} \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{4N} \int dx \, \left[\psi^\dagger(x)\, \partial_x \eta, \frac{d}{dx} \fint dy \, \frac{\psi(y)}{x-y} \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{4N} \int dx \, \left[\psi^\dagger(x), \frac{d}{dx} \fint dy \, \frac{\psi(y)}{x-y}\, \partial_y \eta \right] + o\left(\frac{1}{N^2} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

and the supercharges (3.11) are

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \sqrt{\phi_0}\int dx\,\psi^\dagger(x)\left[p(x) - i\oint dy\,\frac{\partial_y\eta}{x-y}\right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2N\sqrt{\phi_0}}\int dx\,\psi^\dagger(x)\Big[\partial_x\eta\left(p(x) - i\oint dy\,\frac{\partial_y\eta}{x-y}\right) \\ &\quad - i\left((\partial_x\psi^\dagger)\psi - \psi^\dagger(\partial_x\psi)\right)\Big] + o\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right), \\ Q^\dagger &= \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

The double scaling limit can now be taken by letting $N \to \infty$ and $L \to \infty$ while keeping the dressed string coupling constant $g_{\rm st} = 1/(N\phi_0^2)$ constant. This is best seen by defining $d\tau = dx/\phi_0$ and rescaling $p \to p/\phi_0$, $\psi \to \psi/\sqrt{\phi_0}$, $\psi^\dagger \to \psi^\dagger/\sqrt{\phi_0}$. The length of the "extra dimension" (*i.e.*, the range of integration of $\tau \equiv x/\phi_0 = Lx$) becomes infinite in the scaling limit.

We now proceed to obtain the spectrum as well as the three string vertices in a creation-annihilation basis. For this we introduce the expansions

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(x,t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{n\neq 0}\frac{1}{\sqrt{|n|}}\left(a_n(t)\,e^{2\pi i n x/L} + a_n^\dagger(t)\,e^{-2\pi i n x/L}\right), \\ p(x,t) &= \frac{2\pi}{L}\sum_{n\neq 0}\frac{\sqrt{|n|}}{2i}\left(a_n(t)\,e^{2\pi i n x/L} - a_n^\dagger(t)\,e^{-2\pi i n x/L}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

$$\psi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}\sum_{n\neq 0} b_n(t)\,e^{2\pi i n x/L}, \quad \psi^\dagger(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}\sum_{n\neq 0} b_n^\dagger(t)\,e^{-2\pi i n x/L} \tag{4.16}$$

with (anti-)commutation relations

$$[a_n, a_m^\dagger] = \delta_{mn}, \qquad [a_n, a_m] = [a_n^\dagger, a_m^\dagger] = 0, \tag{4.17}$$

$$\{b_n, b_m^\dagger\} = \delta_{mn}, \qquad \{b_n, b_m\} = \{b_n^\dagger, b_m^\dagger\} = 0. \tag{4.18}$$

One then obtains, after some algebra

$$H = {H_0}^B + {H_0}^F + \frac{1}{N}{H_3}^B + \frac{1}{N}{H_3}^F + o\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right),$$

with

$${H_0}^B = \frac{2\pi^2}{L}\phi_0 \sum_n |n|\,(a_n^\dagger a_n + \frac{1}{2}),$$

$${H_0}^F = \frac{2\pi^2}{L}\phi_0 \sum_n |n|\,(b_n^\dagger b_n - \frac{1}{2}),$$

$${H_3}^B = \frac{i}{2}\left(\frac{2\pi}{L}\right)^2 \sum_{\substack{n_1,n_2>0\\ n_1,n_2<0}} \sqrt{n_1 n_2 |n_1+n_2|}\,\epsilon(n_1+n_2)\,(a^\dagger_{n_1+n_2}a_{n_1}a_{n_2} - \text{h.c.}),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
{H_3}^F = {} & i\left(\frac{2\pi}{L}\right)^2 \sum_{\substack{n_1,n_2>0\\ n_1,n_2<0}} n_1\sqrt{|n_2|}\,(b^\dagger_{n_1+n_2}b_{n_1}a_{n_2} - b^\dagger_{n_1}b_{n_1+n_2}a^\dagger_{n_2}) \\
& - \frac{i}{2}\left(\frac{2\pi}{L}\right)^2 \sum_{\substack{n_1,n_2>0\\ n_1,n_2<0}} n_2\sqrt{|n_2|}\,(b^\dagger_{n_1}b_{n_1+n_2}a_{-n_2} - b^\dagger_{n_1+n_2}b_{n_1}a^\dagger_{-n_2}) \\
& - \frac{i}{2}\left(\frac{2\pi}{L}\right)^2 \sum_{\substack{n_1,n_2>0\\ n_1,n_2<0}} n_1\sqrt{|n_1+n_2|}\,(b^\dagger_{n_2}b_{-n_1}a_{n_1+n_2} - b^\dagger_{-n_1}b_{n_2}a^\dagger_{n_1+n_2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

The presence of Majorana fermions is evident from the quadratic part of equation (4.19).

To summarise, in this section we discussed the perturbation theory for the free case. We exhibited the explicit two and three point functions and identified the fluctuations to be at the semiclassical level those of a massless scalar and a massless Majorana fermion.

4.4. Comparison with supergravity

It is instructive to try to understand the supersymmetric collective field theory with reference to two dimensional supergravity and non-linear sigma models.

Neglecting the Lagrange multiplier contribution, we consider the bosonic collective string field Lagrangian

$$\frac{L_B}{N^2} = \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\,\dot{\varphi}^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{6}\int dx\,(\partial_x\varphi)^3. \tag{4.20}$$

Defining a two dimensional metric

$$g_{\alpha\beta}(\phi) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \partial_x\varphi & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{3}{\pi^2}(\frac{1}{\partial_x\varphi}) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.21}$$

we notice that the action associated with the Lagrangian (4.20) can be written as

$$\frac{S_B}{N^2} = \frac{1}{2}\int dx \int dt\, g^{\alpha\beta}(\phi)\,\partial_\alpha\varphi\,\partial_\beta\varphi. \tag{4.22}$$

It has already been pointed out elsewhere [2, 6] that, in the presence of a potential, the quadratic action is that of a scalar tachyonic field coupled to a nontrivial classical background, and that the one loop quantum correction to the ground state energy can be understood entirely as resulting from an anomaly in the reparametrization that transforms the metric to a flat one. It turns out that in the potential free case, the full action is of this form.

Because in two dimensions both the target space and the world sheet have the same dimension, there are two ways in which one can look at the action (4.22). One is to regard it as a nonlinear sigma model for the centre of mass coordinate (tachyon) of the string. In this case, the Lagrange multiplier contribution can be thought of as being of a topological nature, since $\int dx\,\partial_x\varphi = 1$. The $1/N$ expansion then corresponds to an expansion about a translational noninvariant

background. Physically, $\phi_0 =$ constant implies that $\varphi_0 \sim x$, and interchanging the roles of x and t (it is well known that the collective space-time coordinates are interchanged in comparison with the first quantized Liouville approach, for instance), one has $\varphi_0 \sim t$ plus oscillator contributions. In this picture, the zero mode can be associated with a classical uniform motion of the centre of mass.

Alternatively, since $\det g =$ constant, one can think of (4.22) as an action for the matter field φ in a gauge fixed gravitational background. It would be of interest, of course, to establish whether the residual simmetries of (4.22) are related to the symmetry algebra uncovered in [4, 5] and also whether the identification (4.21) is consistent with recently proposed effective actions for the gravitational states of the theory [24]. These questions, however, are outside the scope of this thesis.

For our purposes, given that there is a well defined procedure that generalizes the action of a two dimensional scalar field in a gravitational background to two dimensional supergravity, we ask ourselves if the supersymmetric collective field theory corresponds to two dimensional supergravity in a gauge consistent with (4.21).

Before doing so, we introduce some notation. We notice that

$$\frac{i}{\pi}\,\frac{d}{dx}\int dy\,\frac{e^{iky}}{x-y} = \epsilon(k)\,\frac{d}{dx}\,e^{ikx} = i|k|e^{ikx}. \tag{4.23}$$

It is therefore natural to define the operator

$$|\partial_x|\xi \equiv \frac{i}{\pi}\frac{d}{dx}\int dy\,\frac{\xi(y)}{x-y}, \tag{4.24}$$

which we will call the "absolute" derivative. Its properties include

$$|\partial_x|e^{ikx} = i|k|e^{ikx}, \qquad |\partial_x|e^{-ikx} = i|k|e^{-ikx},$$

$$|\partial_x|\xi^\dagger = -(|\partial_x|\xi)^\dagger, \qquad \int dy\,\frac{\partial_y\xi}{x-y} = -i\pi|\partial_x|\xi. \tag{4.25}$$

Suggestive as the notation may be, it should be noted that the absolute derivative does not obey a Leibnitz rule.

We rewrite the action corresponding to the Lagrangian (2.16) in the free case in terms of the absolute derivative:

$$\begin{aligned} S = & \frac{1}{2}\int dx \int dt\, g^{\alpha\beta}(\phi)\,\partial_\alpha\varphi\,\partial_\beta\varphi \\ & + \frac{i}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\,(\psi^\dagger\partial_t\psi - \partial_t\psi^\dagger\psi) \\ & + \frac{i}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi^2}\,\partial_t\varphi\,(\partial_x\psi^\dagger\psi - \psi^\dagger\partial_x\psi) \\ & + i\pi\int dt\int dx\,\psi^\dagger|\partial_x|\psi - i\pi\int dt\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\,\psi^\dagger\psi\,|\partial_x|\phi. \end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

In terms of real Majorana components ($\psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\psi_1 - i\psi_2)$),

$$\begin{aligned} S = & \frac{1}{2}\int dx \int dt\, g^{\alpha\beta}(\phi)\,\partial_\alpha\varphi\,\partial_\beta\varphi \\ & + \frac{i}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\,(\psi_1\partial_t\psi_1 + \psi_2\partial_t\psi_2) \\ & - \frac{i}{2}\int \frac{dx}{\phi^2}\,\partial_t\varphi\,(\psi_1\partial_x\psi_1 + \psi_2\partial_x\psi_2) \\ & - \frac{\pi}{2}\int dt\int dx\;(\psi_2|\partial_x|\psi_1 - \psi_1|\partial_x|\psi_2) \\ & + \frac{\pi}{2}\int dt\int \frac{dx}{\phi}\;(\psi_2\psi_1 - \psi_1\psi_2)\,|\partial_x|\phi. \end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

The two dimensional supergravity action is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\rm sg} = & \frac{1}{2}\int d^2\sigma\, e\, g^{\alpha\beta}\,\partial_\alpha\varphi\,\partial_\beta\varphi + \frac{i}{2}\int d^2\sigma\, e\,\bar\lambda\,\rho^\alpha\partial_\alpha\lambda \\ & - \int d^2\sigma\, e\,\bar\chi_\alpha\,\rho^\beta\rho^\alpha\lambda\,\partial_\beta\varphi - \frac{1}{4}\int d^2\sigma\, e\,\bar\lambda\lambda\,\bar\chi_\alpha\,\rho^\beta\rho^\alpha\chi_\beta, \end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

using the conventions of [25].

The simplest gauge fixing condition consistent with (4.21) is

$$e^a_\alpha \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\phi} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{\phi/3}} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.29}$$

Then the quadratic piece and the interaction terms containing time derivatives in

(4.28) are given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{\rm sg} = & \frac{1}{2}\int d^2\sigma\, e\, g^{\alpha\beta}\,\partial_\alpha\varphi\,\partial_\beta\varphi + \frac{i}{2}\int \frac{d^2\sigma\, e}{\sqrt{\phi}}\,(\lambda_-\partial_t\lambda_- + \lambda_+\partial_t\lambda_+) \\
& + \frac{i\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}\int d^2\sigma\sqrt{\phi}\,(\lambda_-\partial_x\lambda_- - \lambda_+\partial_x\lambda_+) \\
& - \int \frac{d^2\sigma\, e}{\sqrt{\phi}}\,(\chi_0^T\gamma^0\lambda)\,\dot{\varphi} - \frac{\pi}{3}\int d^2\sigma\, e\,(\chi_1^T\gamma^1\lambda)\,\dot{\varphi} + \cdots .
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.30}
$$

With a further choice $\chi_0 = i\gamma^0\partial_x\lambda/\phi$; $\chi_1 = 0$, the fermionic terms involving time derivatives in (4.30) can be brought into a form similar to those of (4.27) if we let $\lambda = \psi/\phi^{1/4}$.

One encounters several difficulties when trying to push the analogy any further. First, equation (4.28) contains terms quartic in the fermion fields, which are absent from (4.27). Second, in trying to match the terms involving spatial derivatives one finds that, apart from different numerical constants, equation (4.27) contains "absolute" spatial derivatives which, as pointed out previously, do not obey a Leibnitz rule.

One may ask if it is possible to redefine fields so that "absolute" derivatives are replaced by standard derivatives, especially in view of the fact that the identity (4.8) can be stated as

$$
\int dx\,\partial_x\varphi\,(|\partial_x|\varphi)^2 = \frac{1}{3}\int dx\,(\partial_x\varphi)^3 - \frac{1}{3L^2}\left(\int dx\,\partial_x\varphi\right)^3 .
\tag{4.31}
$$

One finds that for a term such as

$$
-i\int dx\,\psi^\dagger|\partial_x|\psi = \frac{1}{2}\int dx\,(\psi_2|\partial_x|\psi_1 - \psi_1|\partial_x|\psi_2),
\tag{4.32}
$$

such a transformation exists: If

$$
\psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_n b_n e^{2\pi i n x/L}, \qquad \psi^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_n b_n^\dagger e^{-2\pi i n x/L},
\tag{4.33}
$$

and we let

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_+ &= \sum_n \frac{\theta(n)}{\sqrt{L}} \left[\left(\frac{1-i}{\sqrt{2}} \right) b_n e^{inx} + \left(\frac{1+i}{\sqrt{2}} \right) b_n^\dagger e^{-inx} \right] \\ \psi_- &= \sum_n \frac{\theta(-n)}{\sqrt{L}} \left[\left(\frac{1-i}{\sqrt{2}} \right) b_n e^{inx} + \left(\frac{1+i}{\sqrt{2}} \right) b_n^\dagger e^{-inx} \right],\end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}-i \int dx\, \psi^\dagger |\partial_x| \psi &= \frac{1}{2} \int dx\, (\psi_2 |\partial_x| \psi_1 - \psi_1 |\partial_x| \psi_2) \\ &= \frac{i}{2} \int dx\, (\psi_- \partial_x \psi_- - \psi_+ \partial_x \psi_+).\end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

However, such a procedure does not seem to be generalizable to the interaction terms.

In conclusion, the supersymmetric collective field theory, which provides a continuum description of the supersymmetric extension of matrix model eigenvalue dynamics, is not reducible to a gauge fixed two dimensional supergravity theory, unlike its bosonic counterpart.

4.5. Exact nonperturbative results

The bosonic part of our Hamiltonian (4.13) coincides with the free bosonic collective field Hamiltonian, for which a nonperturbative analysis was carried out in [17]. There the exact, nonperturbative spectrum was obtained by explicitly diagonalising the full bosonic Hamiltonian $H^B = {H_0}^B + \frac{1}{N}{H_3}^B$. As H_3 commutes with H_0, the energy eigenvalues are simply the eigenvalues of the quadratic piece plus a correction of order $1/N$. The exact spectrum is found by exploiting the correspondence between the collective field Hamiltonian and the matrix model Laplacian, whose eigenstates are just the character polynomials of $U(N)$. A subset of these character polynomials consists of the "single particle" branches which can be written in the continuum limit as

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\Psi(k)\rangle &= \left(i\,\epsilon(k)\,a_k^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^k dk'\,\epsilon(k')\,\epsilon(k-k')\,a_{k'}^\dagger a_{k-k'}^\dagger + \cdots \right)|0\rangle, \\
|\tilde{\Psi}(k)\rangle &= \left(i\,\epsilon(k)\,a_k^\dagger + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^k dk'\,\epsilon(k')\,\epsilon(k-k')\,a_{k'}^\dagger a_{k-k'}^\dagger + \cdots \right)|0\rangle,
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.36}
$$

with energies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\omega(k) &= \pi\phi_0|k| + \frac{k^2}{2N}, \\
\tilde{\omega}(k) &= \pi\phi_0|k| - \frac{k^2}{2N}, \quad (0 < |k| < k_F \equiv \pi\phi_0).
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.37}
$$

Note that our expressions for the states differ from those in [17], as there the fundamental fields for the the expansions were taken to be $\phi \equiv \partial_x\varphi$ and $\Pi \equiv -\partial_x p$. Transforming $a_k \to -i\,\epsilon(k)\,a_k$; $a_k^\dagger \to i\,\epsilon(k)\,a_k^\dagger$, we regain the expressions of reference [17].

The states (4.36), being eigenstates of the purely bosonic part of the supersymmetric Hamiltonian, are also eigenstates of the full supersymmetric Hamiltonian. We can therefore use the fundamental property of supersymmetric Hamiltonians

that if $|\Psi\rangle$ is an eigenstate with non-vanishing energy, then $Q|\Psi\rangle$ is another eigenstate degenerate with the first. Note that the state $Q|\Psi\rangle$ implicitly contains terms up to infinite order in $1/N$. In our formalism, therefore, the concept of the supersymmetric partner of a bosonic eigenstate only makes sense nonperturbatively. Applying the full Hamiltonian to states $Q|\Psi\rangle$, contributions of order $1/N^2$ and higher fall away and we are left with the energies (4.37).

The above properties of the supersymmetric Hamiltonian follow formally from the construction $H = \frac{1}{2}\{Q, Q^\dagger\}$ along with the properties $Q^2 = (Q^\dagger)^2 = 0$. As a final check of the correctness of the theory, one might verify in a perturbative context that states $|\Psi\rangle$ and $Q|\Psi\rangle$ have the same energy up to a given order in $1/N$. To check that the above is true up to order $1/N$ it is sufficient to show that $H_0 + \frac{1}{N}H_3$ commutes with $Q_0 + \frac{1}{N}Q_3$ up to corrections of order $1/N^2$. Explicitly, the oscillator expansion of Q reads

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0 &= 2\pi\sqrt{\frac{\phi_0}{L}}\sum_{m\neq 0}\sqrt{|k_m|}\, b_m^\dagger a_m, \\ Q_3 &= \frac{1}{L^3\phi_0}\sum_{n,m\neq 0}\epsilon(n)\sqrt{|k_n k_m|}\left(b_{m+n}^\dagger a_n a_m - b_{m-n}^\dagger a_n^\dagger a_m^\dagger\right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

Using the expressions (4.38) and (4.19), it is a straightforward (though tedious) exercise to verify that H indeed commutes with Q to order $1/N$.

To summarise, by identifying the bosonic part of the supersymmetric theory with the bosonic collective field theory, and using the fact that the exact spectrum of the latter is known, we can in principle use the supercharge to generate the exact spectrum of the supersymmetric theory. In practice this procedure is complicated by the fact that the supercharge has an infinite perturbative expansion.

4.6. Alternative representation of exact states

We now show that there exists a concise representation of the fermionic partners of the exact bosonic states in terms of the *unrescaled* fields of chapter 2. This discussion is based on work done in a different context by B. Sazdović [33].

The supercharge Q in (2.10) was given in terms of the fields (2.7) in the free case as

$$Q = \int dx\, \psi^\dagger(x) \left(\sigma(x) - i \fint dy\, \frac{\partial_y \eta}{x-y} \right), \tag{4.39}$$

where the fields satisfied the commutation relations

$$\begin{aligned} [\sigma(x), \eta(y)] &= -i\, \delta(x-y), \\ [\sigma(x), \psi^\dagger(y)] &= i\, \frac{\psi^\dagger}{\phi}(x)\, \partial_x \delta(x-y), \\ [\sigma(x), \psi(y)] &= i\, \frac{\psi}{\phi}(x)\, \partial_x \delta(x-y), \\ \{\psi(x), \psi^\dagger(y)\} &= \phi(x)\, \delta(x-y), \end{aligned} \tag{4.40}$$

with $\phi \equiv \phi_0 + \partial\eta$. We emphasize that we are now working with σ and not p, and that these ψ's are not the ones used in the rest of the chapter. In terms of these fields the exact states can be written in a particularly compact form as follows [33]. On $[-L, L]$ one can expand

$$\begin{aligned} \eta &\equiv \sqrt{\frac{1}{4\pi L}} \sum_n \frac{1}{\sqrt{|k_n|}} \left(a_n e^{ik_n x} + a_n^\dagger e^{-ik_n x} \right), \\ \sigma &\equiv -i \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4L}} \sum_n \sqrt{|k_n|} \left(a_n e^{ik_n x} - a_n^\dagger e^{-ik_n x} \right), \\ \psi^\dagger &\equiv \sqrt{\frac{1}{2L}} \sum_n b_n^\dagger e^{-ik_n x}, \\ \psi &\equiv \sqrt{\frac{1}{2L}} \sum_n b_n e^{ik_n x}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.41}$$

where $k_n \equiv \pi n / L$ and $[a_m, a_n] = \delta_{mn}$ as usual but $\{b_m, b_n^\dagger\}$ and $[b_m^{(\dagger)}, a_m^{(\dagger)}]$ are nontrivial.

In terms of these oscillators the supercharge has the simple form

$$Q = -i\sqrt{2\pi}\sum_{m\neq 0}\sqrt{|k_m|}\, b_m^\dagger a_m. \tag{4.42}$$

Also, from $[\psi^\dagger, \eta] = 0$ it follows that $[b_m^\dagger, a_n^\dagger + a_{-n}] = 0$, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}[Q, a_n^\dagger + a_{-n}] &= -i\sqrt{2\pi|k_n|}\, b_n^\dagger \\ &= -i\sqrt{\frac{2\pi^2|n|}{L}}\, b_n^\dagger.\end{aligned} \tag{4.43}$$

From [17] we know that one branch of exact states can be written in terms of the so-called Schur polynomials P_n as

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi_n\rangle &= P_n(\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \ldots)|0\rangle \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint dz\, z^{-n-1}\exp\left\{\sum_{n>0}\tilde{a}_n^\dagger z^n\right\}|0\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint dz\, z^{-n-1}\exp\left\{-i\sum_{n>0}\frac{a_n^\dagger}{\sqrt{n}}\, z^n\right\}|0\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint dz\, z^{-n-1}\exp\left\{-i\sum_{n>0}\frac{(a_n^\dagger + a_{-n})}{\sqrt{n}}\, z^n\right\}|0\rangle,\end{aligned} \tag{4.44}$$

where $\tilde{a}_n^\dagger \equiv -i\epsilon(n)a_n^\dagger/\sqrt{|n|}$. The last step follows from the fact that the a_{-n} commute with the a_n for $n > 0$ and annihilate the vacuum.

Now using the fact that the combination $a_n^\dagger + a_{-n}$ tranforms under Q as in (4.43) and commutes with the b_n, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}Q|\Psi_n\rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint dz\, z^{-n-1}&\left(-\sum_{n>0}\sqrt{\frac{2\pi^2}{L}}\, b_n^\dagger z^n\right)\times \\ &\times\exp\left\{-i\sum_{n>0}\frac{(a_n^\dagger + a_{-n})}{\sqrt{n}}\, z^n\right\}|0\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{4.45}$$

This can be written in a simpler form by notin that for ε Grassman one has

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\varepsilon Q}|\Psi_n\rangle &= (1+\varepsilon Q)|\Psi_n\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\exp\left\{\sum_{n>0}\left[(-i)\frac{(a_n^\dagger + a_{-n})}{\sqrt{n}} - \sqrt{\frac{2\pi^2}{L}}\,\varepsilon b_n^\dagger\right] z^n\right\}|0\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{4.46}$$

so that

$$e^{\varepsilon Q}|\Psi_n\rangle = P_n(\tilde{a}_1^\dagger + \tilde{a}_{-1} + \varepsilon\tilde{b}_1^\dagger, \tilde{a}_2^\dagger + \tilde{a}_{-2} + \varepsilon\tilde{b}_2^\dagger, \ldots)|0\rangle, \tag{4.47}$$

where $\tilde{b}_n^\dagger \equiv -\sqrt{2\pi^2/L}\, b_n^\dagger$.

We can therefore write the superpartner of the state $|\Psi_n\rangle$ as

$$\begin{aligned} Q|\Psi_n\rangle &= \int d\varepsilon\, e^{\varepsilon Q}|\Psi_n\rangle \\ &= \int d\varepsilon\, P_n(\tilde{a}_k^\dagger + \tilde{a}_{-k} + \varepsilon\tilde{b}_k^\dagger)|0\rangle \\ &\equiv P_{S(n)}(\tilde{a}_k^\dagger + \tilde{a}_{-k}, \tilde{b}_k^\dagger)|0\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{4.48}$$

where $P_{S(n)}$ as defined above may be called a "super-Schur polynomial" [33].

The above analysis can be extended to find the superpartner of a general state, given by [17]

$$|\Psi\rangle_{(n_1,\ldots,n_N)} \equiv \xi_{(n_1,\ldots,n_N)}(\tilde{a}_k^\dagger + \tilde{a}_{-k})|0\rangle, \tag{4.49}$$

where $\xi_{(n_1,\ldots,n_N)}$ is a general character polynomial [30]. One finds

$$Q|\Psi\rangle_{(n_1,\ldots,n_N)} = \int d\varepsilon\, \xi_{(n_1,\ldots,n_N)}(\tilde{a}_k^\dagger + \tilde{a}_{-k} + \varepsilon\tilde{b}_k^\dagger)|0\rangle, \tag{4.50}$$

in complete analogy with (4.48).

In conclusion, we have obtained a compact expression for the exact states in the supersymmetric theory. This was achieved, however, in a picture in which the oscillators have nontrivial commutation relations with each other.

4.7. Semiclassical analysis

We now address the possibility of reproducing nonperturbative effects in a semiclassical analysis. In the previous section we noted that the exact analysis of the bosonic sector of the theory produces two "single particle" branches (4.36) with dispersion relations (4.37). The fact that the corrections to the particle energies in (4.37) are of order $1/N$ instead of the natural perturbation parameter $1/N^2$, implies that these corrections are due to a nonperturbative effect.

The question of addressing this effect in a semiclassical analysis for the bosonic string was discussed in [17]. There an effective Lagrangian and Hamiltonian were written down for each of the particle branches in (4.36), which fit the exact dispersions given by equation (4.37) already at the quadratic level. The effective Hamiltonian for the first particle branch was shown to be given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\text{eff}} = \int dx \Big\{ & \frac{1}{2N^2}\phi\, p^2 + \frac{1}{8}\frac{\phi_{,x}^2}{\phi} + \frac{N^2\pi^2}{6}\,\phi^3(x) \\ & + \frac{N}{2}\,\phi_{,x} \fint \frac{dy}{x-y}\,\phi(y) \Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.51}$$

To extend this programme to the supersymmetric case, we suggest that the proper effective Hamiltonian to use would be the one constructed from the supercharges

$$\begin{aligned} Q &\equiv \int dx\, \psi^\dagger(x) \left(\frac{\sigma(x)}{N} - iN \fint dy\, \frac{\partial_y \varphi}{x-y} - \frac{i}{2}\frac{\phi_{,x}}{\phi} \right), \\ Q^\dagger &\equiv \int dx\, \psi(x) \left(\frac{\sigma(x)}{N} + iN \fint dy\, \frac{\partial_y \varphi}{x-y} + \frac{i}{2}\frac{\phi_{,x}}{\phi} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.52}$$

The bosonic part of $H_{\text{eff}} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\{Q, Q^\dagger\}$ is then easily seen to give the expression (4.51).

Whereas the original cubic bosonic collective field theory exhibited nonperturbative states once exactly solved, the effective Hamiltonian in equation (4.51) exhibits these states at a semiclassical level. The first particle branch in (4.36)

follows immediately from the spectrum of the quadratic piece, while the second branch was shown in [17] to correspond to nontrivial soliton solutions of the effective Hamiltonian.

Within the context of the effective theory generated by the supercharges in (4.52), whose effective potential is given by

$$V_{\text{eff}} = \int dx \left\{ \frac{1}{8} \frac{\phi_{,x}^2}{\phi} + \frac{N^2 \pi^2}{6} \phi^3(x) + \frac{N}{2} \phi_{,x} \int \frac{dy}{x-y} \phi(y) \right\}, \tag{4.53}$$

one can identify instanton solutions by approximating the dynamics of a single real eigenvalue interacting with the field ϕ in the potential (4.53). Such single real eigenvalue configurations provide, within this framework, a mechanism for supersymmetry breaking.

This concludes our discussion of the free theory, and we now move on to a discussion of the case of a harmonic superpotential.

5. THE HARMONIC CASE

5.1. Motivation

In this chapter, we study the model characterised by the effective superpotential

$$W = \int dx\, \bar{W}(x)\, \partial_x \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \int dx \int dy\, \ln|x-y|\, \partial_x \varphi\, \partial_y \varphi. \tag{5.1}$$

in the case where $\bar{W}(x) = \frac{\omega}{2} x^2$. As remarked before (see (2.46)), this model is a continuum version of the original super-Calogero system (2.5) and (2.6). Equivalently, it can be seen as a continuum formulation of a matrix model of the form (2.31), where the matrix superpotential $\bar{W}(\Phi) = \frac{\omega}{2}\Phi^2$ is purely harmonic. This system has been studied in the collective field formalism before in [16], and an expanded version of their analysis will be presented here.

5.2. The vacuum density

We start the analysis by solving for the classical vacuum. Due to the fact that the potential is bounded, we shall see that, in contrast to the free case, no regularization is needed at this level. On the other hand, due to turning point singularities the fluctuations do have to be regularized. This issue will be discussed in sections (5.4) and (5.5).

Using $v(x) = W'(x) = \omega x$, the leading contribution to the ground state energy of the Hamitonian (3.10) is given by

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\phi_0) = \frac{N^2}{2} \int dx\, \phi_0(x) \left(\fint dy\, \frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} - \omega x \right)^2. \tag{5.2}$$

For supersymmetry to be unbroken to leading order in N the vacuum configuration

of the density field must satisfy

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\phi_0) = 0. \tag{5.3}$$

This will be the case if

$$\fint dy \, \frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} - \omega x = 0, \tag{5.4}$$

where ϕ_0 must satify the constraint $\int \phi_0 = 1$.

The equation (5.4) may be solved as follows : assume ϕ_0 has support on some interval $(-a, a)$ and introduce the analytic function

$$F(z) \equiv \int_{-a}^{a} dy \, \frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} \tag{5.5}$$

defined for complex z outside the interval $(-a, a)$. By construction, F is analytic in the complex plane with a cut along $(-a, a)$, behaves as $1/z$ as $z \to \infty$ (due to the normalization of ϕ_0) and satisfies

$$F(x \pm i\varepsilon) = \omega x \mp i\pi\phi_0(x) \tag{5.6}$$

for $x \in (-a, a)$. It is easy to check that

$$F(z) = \omega z - \omega\sqrt{z^2 - a^2} \tag{5.7}$$

satisfies these conditions provided $a = \sqrt{2/\omega}$, which implies that ϕ_0 is given in the interval $(-a, a)$ by

$$\phi_0(x) = \frac{1}{\pi}\sqrt{\mu_F - \omega^2 x^2}; \qquad \mu_F \equiv 2\omega. \tag{5.8}$$

We have found a solution to $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi_0) = 0$ satisfying the constraint $\int \phi_0 = 1$. As V_{eff} is positive definite, this solution is an extremum. We can therefore conclude that for the harmonic superpotential the vacuum energy is zero to leading order in the perturbation expansion.

Alternatively, one could have used the identity (3.4) to express the effective bosonic potential

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\phi) = \frac{N^2}{2} \int dx\, \phi(x) \left(\fint dy\, \frac{\phi(y)}{x-y} - \omega x \right)^2 \tag{5.9}$$

of the Hamiltonian (3.1)in the form

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\phi) = N^2 \left(\frac{\pi^2}{6} \int \phi^3 - \omega \left(\int \phi \right)^2 - \omega^2 \int x^2 \phi \right). \tag{5.10}$$

The background ϕ_0 satisfies the stationarity condition

$$\frac{\pi^2 \phi_0^2}{2} - 2\omega \int \phi_0 + \omega^2 x^2 = 0. \tag{5.11}$$

Thus one gets

$$\phi_0(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \sqrt{\mu_F - \omega^2 x^2}, \tag{5.12}$$

where $\mu_F \equiv 2\omega \int \phi_0$. Requiring that $\int \phi_0 = 1$, one finds $\mu_F = 2\omega$, which is consistent with (5.8).

This concludes our discussion of the vacuum configuration. Expanding about the classical vacuum, we can now move on to a determination of the semiclassical spectrum.

5.3. The quadratic spectrum

We now write the quadratic Hamiltonian in the momentum space representation. This will allow us to demonstrate supersymmetry of the semiclassical spectrum.

Using the property

$$\fint dy\, \frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} - \omega x = 0,$$

and the fact that, due to the constraint, $\int dx\, \partial_x \eta = 0$, one can write the quadratic

piece of the Hamiltonian (3.10) in the harmonic case $v(x) = \omega x$ as

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 = &\frac{1}{2}\int dx\, \phi_0 p^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{2}\int dx\, \phi_0 (\partial_x \eta)^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\int dx\, \left[\psi^\dagger(x)\sqrt{\phi_0(x)}, \frac{d}{dx}\oint dy\, \frac{\psi(y)\sqrt{\phi_0(y)}}{x-y}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

Defining the change of variables $dq = dx/\phi_0$ and rescaling $p \to p/\phi_0$, $\psi \to \psi/\sqrt{\phi_0}$, $\psi^\dagger \to \psi^\dagger/\sqrt{\phi_0}$, the Hamiltonian can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 = &\frac{1}{2}\int dq\, p^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{2}\int dq\, (\partial_q \eta)^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\int dq\, \left[\psi^\dagger(q), \frac{d}{dq}\oint dq'\, \frac{\phi_0(q')\psi(q')}{x(q)-x(q')}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

The reason for choosing this reparametrization is that in q-space the bosonic part of the quadratic Hamiltonian reduces to that of a massless scalar particle in a trivial background. Although less obvious, the fermionic part also has the spectrum of a massless particle, as expected for a system with unbroken supersymmetry. To confirm this property, we move on to a calculation of the spectrum.

Explicitly, the above change of variables reads

$$\begin{aligned} q &= \pi \int \frac{dx}{\sqrt{\mu_F - \omega^2 x^2}} \\ &= \frac{\pi}{\omega} \arccos\frac{-x}{a}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

where q has been chosen to be zero at the turning point $x = -a$. The turning point was found in the previous section to be given by $a = \sqrt{\mu_F}/\omega = \sqrt{2/\omega}$. Inverting (5.15), one finds

$$x = -\sqrt{\frac{2L}{\pi^2}}\cos\frac{\pi q}{L}; \qquad q \in [0, L],$$

where $L = \pi^2/\omega = \pi^2 a^2/2$ is the half period.

Expanding η and p on $[0, L]$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(q) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi^2 n}} \, (a_n + a_n^\dagger) \, \sin \frac{n\pi q}{L}, \\ p(q) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} -i\sqrt{\frac{\pi^2 n}{2L^2}} \, (a_n - a_n^\dagger) \, \sin \frac{n\pi q}{L}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

where $[a_m, a_n^\dagger] = \delta_{mn}$, the bosonic part of the quadratic Hamiltonian becomes

$$H_0{}^B = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n\omega \, (a_n^\dagger a_n + \frac{1}{2}). \tag{5.17}$$

Explicitly, the fermionic part of the quadratic Hamiltonian reads

$$H_0{}^F = \frac{\pi}{2L} \int_0^L dq \, \left[\psi^\dagger(q), \frac{d}{dq} \fint_0^L dq' \, \frac{\sin \frac{\pi q'}{L} \, \psi(q')}{\cos \frac{\pi q'}{L} - \cos \frac{\pi q}{L}} \right]. \tag{5.18}$$

To find the spectrum one expands

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(q) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \, \sin \frac{n\pi q}{L}, \\ \psi^\dagger(q) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n^\dagger \, \sin \frac{n\pi q}{L}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

where $\{b_m, b_n^\dagger\} = \delta_{mn}$.

Inserting this expansion into (5.18), the only nontrivial part of the evaluation is the calculation of the integral

$$\begin{aligned} \fint_0^L dq' \, \frac{\sin \frac{\pi q'}{L} \, \sin \frac{\pi n q'}{L}}{\cos \frac{\pi q'}{L} - \cos \frac{\pi q}{L}} &= \frac{1}{2} \fint_{-L}^L dq' \, \frac{\sin \frac{\pi q'}{L} \, \sin \frac{\pi n q'}{L}}{\cos \frac{\pi q'}{L} - \cos \frac{\pi q}{L}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \, \mathrm{Im} \fint_{-L}^L dq' \, \frac{\sin \frac{\pi q'}{L} \, \exp \frac{i\pi n q'}{L}}{\cos \frac{\pi q'}{L} - \cos \frac{\pi q}{L}}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

which can be done by closing the contour in the upper half plane, exploiting the fact that the integrand is periodic with period $2L$. The only relevant poles are on

the real line at $+q$ and $-q$. The principal value prescription corresponds to taking half of the residues of any poles that lie on the contour of integration. Applying this, one obtains

$$\int_0^L dq' \, \frac{\sin \frac{\pi q'}{L} \, \sin \frac{\pi n q'}{L}}{\cos \frac{\pi q'}{L} - \cos \frac{\pi q}{L}} = -L \cos \frac{\pi n q}{L}.$$

Using this result, ${H_0}^F$ is now easily rewritten in the form

$${H_0}^F = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n\omega \, (b_n^\dagger b_n - \frac{1}{2}), \tag{5.21}$$

thus explicitly demonstrating supersymmetry of the semiclassical spectrum.

5.4. Three point functions

We now compute the supercharges and three point functions of the quadratic theory in the oscillator basis. This will be a naive calculation, and questions of turning point regularization will be postponed to the next section.

Using (5.4) and changing variables to q-space as in the previous section, the supercharges (3.11) become

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q &= \int_0^L dq\, \psi^\dagger(q) \left\{ p(q) - i\,\phi_0(q) \fint_0^L dq'\, \frac{\partial_{q'}\eta}{x(q)-x(q')} \right\} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2N} \int_0^L \frac{dq}{\phi_0^2}\, \psi^\dagger(q)\, \partial_q\eta \left\{ p(q) - i\,\phi_0(q) \fint_0^L dq'\, \frac{\partial_{q'}\eta}{x(q)-x(q')} \right\} \\
&\quad - \frac{i}{2N} \int_0^L \frac{dq}{\phi_0^2}\, \psi^\dagger(\partial_q\psi^\dagger)\psi + o\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right), \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-L}^L dq\, \psi^\dagger(q) \left\{ p(q) - i\,\phi_0(q) \fint_0^L dq'\, \frac{\partial_{q'}\eta}{x(q)-x(q')} \right\} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4N} \int_{-L}^L \frac{dq}{\phi_0^2}\, \psi^\dagger(q)\, \partial_q\eta \left\{ p(q) - i\,\phi_0(q) \fint_0^L dq'\, \frac{\partial_{q'}\eta}{x(q)-x(q')} \right\} \\
&\quad - \frac{i}{4N} \int_{-L}^L \frac{dq}{\phi_0^2}\, \psi^\dagger(\partial_q\psi^\dagger)\psi + o\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right), \\
Q^\dagger &= \text{h.c.},
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.22}
$$

where we have used the fact that the fields satisfy Dirichlet boundary conditions to extend the integral between $-L$ and L.

We now expand, as in the previous section

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta(q) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi L}} \sum_{n>0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|k_n|}} \left(a_n + a_n^\dagger\right) \sin k_n q, \\
&= \frac{1}{2i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi L}} \sum_{n\neq 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|k_n|}} \left(a_n e^{ik_n q} + a_n^\dagger e^{-ik_n q}\right), \\
p(q) &= -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2L}} \sum_{n\neq 0} \sqrt{|k_n|}\, \left(a_n e^{ik_n q} - a_n^\dagger e^{-ik_n q}\right), \\
\psi(q) &= \frac{1}{2i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{n\neq 0} b_n\, e^{ik_n q}, \\
\psi^\dagger(q) &= -\frac{1}{2i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{n\neq 0} b_n^\dagger\, e^{-ik_n q},
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.23}
$$

where $k_n = \pi n/L$ and where for convenience we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} a_{-n} &\equiv -a_n, \qquad a^\dagger_{-n} \equiv -a^\dagger_n, \\ b_{-n} &\equiv -b_n, \qquad b^\dagger_{-n} \equiv -b^\dagger_n, \end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

for $n > 0$.

For the quadratic term in Q one needs to compute terms of the type

$$\phi_0(q) \fint_0^L dq' \, \frac{e^{ik_n q'}}{x(q) - x(q')},$$

where $x = -\sqrt{\frac{2L}{\pi^2}} \cos \frac{\pi q}{L}$ and $\phi_0 = x' = \sqrt{\frac{2}{L}} \sin(\pi q/L)$. This can easily be done via a contour integration similar to that in the previous section. One finds

$$\phi_0(q) \fint_0^L dq' \, \frac{e^{ik_n q'}}{x(q) - x(q')} = -\pi i \, \epsilon(k_n) \, e^{ik_n q}. \tag{5.25}$$

Using (5.25), the quadratic term becomes simply

$$Q_0 = -i \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sum_{m>0} \sqrt{k_m} \, b^\dagger_m a_m. \tag{5.26}$$

For the cubic terms in Q one needs to compute the integrals

$$\fint_{-L}^L dq \, \frac{e^{ik_n q}}{\phi_0^2(q)}.$$

For $n > 0$ this can be done by extending the contour in the upper half plane vertically upwards at $-L$ and L. Exploiting the fact that the integrand is periodic with period $2L$, it follows that the vertical contributions cancel. For $n < 0$ one can similarly close the contour in the lower half plane. The function $1/\phi_0^2 = L/2 \sin^2(\pi q/L)$ has singularities on the contour at $-L$, at 0 and at L. Applying a principal part regularization, which corresponds to taking half of the residues of

any poles that lie fully on the contour and 1/4 of the residues of poles that are located at the corners $-L$ and L, one finds that for n odd the integral vanishes while for n even it is given by

$$\oint_{-L}^{L} dq \, \frac{e^{ik_n q}}{\phi_0^2(q)} = -\frac{L^3}{\pi} \, |k_n|. \tag{5.27}$$

Using this result one finds, after some algebra, that the cubic piece of Q is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_3 = & \frac{iL\sqrt{L}}{8\pi N} \sum_{m,n,p\neq 0}{}' \epsilon(n) \sqrt{|k_n k_p|} \, |k_m + k_n + k_p| \, (b^\dagger_{-m} a_n a_p - b^\dagger_{-m} a^\dagger_{-n} a_p) \\ & + \frac{iL\sqrt{L}}{8\pi N} \sum_{m,n,p\neq 0}{}' k_n |k_m + k_n - k_p| \, b^\dagger_m b^\dagger_n b_p, \end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

where the primes on the sums indicate that one only sums over indices such that the arguments of the absolute value signs are even.

The cubic piece of the Hamiltonian can now be generated from (5.26) and (5.28) using $H = \frac{1}{2}\{Q, Q^\dagger\}$. One finds, after some algebra, that

$$H_3 = {H_3}^B + {H_3}^F,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} {H_3}^B = & \frac{L}{4N}\sqrt{\frac{L}{2\pi}} \sum_{n,p,l>0}{}' \sqrt{k_l k_n k_p} \, \big(|k_l + k_n + k_p| \\ & - |k_l - k_n - k_p| \big) \, a^\dagger_n a^\dagger_p a_l + \text{h.c.}, \\ {H_3}^F = & \frac{L}{8N}\sqrt{\frac{L}{2\pi}} \sum_{n,p,l>0}{}' \sqrt{k_l} \, (k_p - k_n) \, \big(|k_l + k_n + k_p| - |k_l + k_n - k_p| \\ & + |k_l - k_n + k_p| - |k_l - k_n - k_p| \big) \, b^\dagger_n b_p a^\dagger_l + \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

These expressions have been calculated using a principal part prescription to regularize turning point divergences. In the next chapter we shall present a more careful discussion of the regularization.

5.5. Turning point divergences

We now discuss the regularization of turning point divergences as it applies to the calculation of the three point functions of the previous section.

In chapter 3 it was mentioned that there may in general be subtleties in the application of the identity

$$\int dx\, \partial_x \eta \left(\fint dy\, \frac{\partial_y \eta}{x-y} \right)^2 = \frac{\pi^2}{3} \int dx\, (\partial_x \eta)^3 \tag{5.30}$$

given in q-space by

$$\int dq\, \partial_q \eta \left(\fint_0^L dq'\, \frac{\partial_{q'} \eta}{x(q) - x(q')} \right)^2 = \frac{\pi^2}{3} \int \frac{dq}{\phi_0^2}\, (\partial_q \eta)^3, \tag{5.31}$$

used to simplify the cubic piece of the Hamiltonian.

Indeed, in chapter 4 we saw that in the potential free case we had to introduce a periodic regularization in order to make the right hand side of (5.30) convergent.

In the present case, due to the fact that the potential is bounded, there are no problems in applying (5.30) or (5.31) to the the classical vacuum ϕ_0. However, at the level of the fluctuations $\partial\eta$, turning point divergences will arise on the right hand side of the identity and have to be suitably regulated. This was already realized in [6] in the context of the bosonic collective field theory.

In the calculation of the oscillator expansions in the previous section, we effectively started from the left hand side of (5.31). Our regularization scheme consisted of naively taking principal parts at the turning points. On the other hand, the authors of [6] started from the right hand side of (5.31), their regularization also coming down to taking principal parts. Comparing the bosonic part of our Hamiltonian (5.29) to the one that was obtained in [6] for the bosonic collective field theory, we see that our expression differs from theirs in that we have no terms of the form $a_m a_n a_p$.

To see this difference more clearly, note that starting from the left hand side of (5.31), assuming that η obeys Dirichlet boundary conditions so that we can expand $\partial_q \eta = \sum_{n>0} \phi_n \cos k_n q$, and using the naive principal part prescription, one finds

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int dq\, \partial_q \eta \left(\fint_0^L dq' \, \frac{\partial_{q'} \eta}{x(q) - x(q')} \right)^2 \\
&\qquad = -\frac{\pi L^3}{24} \sum_{mnp>0}{}' \phi_m \phi_n \phi_p \big(-3|k_m + k_n + k_p| + |k_m - k_p - k_n| \\
&\qquad\quad + |k_m + k_p - k_n| + |k_m - k_p + k_n| \big),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.32}$$

where the result (5.27) has been used. Starting from the right hand side of (5.31) as in the bosonic collective field theory, one finds

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\pi^2}{3} \int \frac{dq}{\phi_0^2} \, (\partial_q \eta)^3 \\
&\qquad = -\frac{\pi L^3}{24} \sum_{mnp>0}{}' \phi_m \phi_n \phi_p \big(|k_m + k_n + k_p| + |k_m - k_p - k_n| \\
&\qquad\quad + |k_m + k_p - k_n| + |k_m - k_p + k_n| \big),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.33}$$

which is manifestly different from the left hand side.

It is therefore obvious that our naive regularization scheme differs from the one used in the bosonic collective field theory. After indicating the origin of this difference, we will argue that the regularization used in the bosonic collective field theory seems to be inconsistent with supersymmetry.

The reason for the difference between (5.32) and (5.33) is as follows: In [6] the turning point divergence in (5.33) was regulated essentially by introducing a cutoff ϵ so that the integration range becomes $\int_\epsilon^{L-\epsilon}$. Keeping epsilon small but finite throughout and only at the end discarding all ϵ-dependent quantities (which are argued to be nonuniversal), one obtains the principal part prescription. Applying

the same cutoff to (5.32) corresponds to identifying the ϵ-independent terms in

$$\int_{\epsilon}^{L-\epsilon} dq \ldots \left(\fint_{\epsilon}^{L-\epsilon} dq' \ldots \right)^2 . \tag{5.34}$$

As it stands, in (5.32) we calculated not the quantities (5.34) but instead

$$\int_{\epsilon}^{L-\epsilon} dq \ldots \left(\fint_{0}^{L} dq' \ldots \right)^2 . \tag{5.35}$$

If we want correspondence with the bosonic cubic collective field theory, we must therefore subtract corrections of the typical form

$$\int_{\epsilon}^{L-\epsilon} dq \ldots \left(\fint_{0}^{L} dq' \ldots \right) \left(\int_{0}^{\epsilon} dq'' \ldots \right) \tag{5.36}$$

from (5.32).

Explicitly, using (5.25) and remembering that $x \propto \cos \pi q/L$ and $\phi_0 \propto \sin \pi q/L$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\epsilon}^{L-\epsilon} dq \, \cos k_m q \fint_{0}^{L} dq' \, \frac{\cos k_n q'}{x(q) - x(q')} \int_{0}^{\epsilon} dq'' \, \frac{\cos k_p q''}{x(q) - x(q'')} \\ &\quad \propto \int_{\epsilon}^{L-\epsilon} dq \, \frac{\cos k_m q \sin k_n q}{\phi_0(q)} \int_{0}^{\epsilon} dq'' \, \frac{\cos k_p q''}{x(q) - x(q'')} \\ &\quad \sim \int_{\epsilon}^{L-\epsilon} dq \, \frac{\cos k_m q \sin k_n q}{\sin \frac{\pi q}{L}} \epsilon \left(\frac{1}{\cos \frac{\pi q}{L} - 1} \right) . \end{aligned} \tag{5.37}$$

To see how we obtain a finite contribution from this, note that one gets an $o(\epsilon)$ contribution from the integral $\int_0^\epsilon dq''$ and an $o(1/\epsilon)$ contribution (see below) from

each of the limits of the integral $\int_\epsilon^{L-\epsilon} dq$. The ϵ-dependence will therefore cancel. More precisely, the small q behaviour of the integrand in (5.37) is given by

$$\cos k_m q \, \frac{\sin \frac{n\pi q}{L}}{\sin \frac{\pi q}{L}} \, \frac{1}{\cos \frac{\pi q}{L} - 1} \sim \frac{n}{\frac{1}{2}\frac{\pi^2 q^2}{L^2}} \propto \frac{k_n}{q^2}.$$

Inserting this into the integral in (5.37), one gets contributions of the form

$$\epsilon \int_\epsilon dq \, \frac{k_n}{q^2} \sim \epsilon \, k_n \, \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sim k_n.$$

We therefore see that these subtractions give rise to finite (*i.e.*, ϵ-independent) corrections to the expansion (5.32) proportional to

$$\sum_{mnp>0} k_n \, \phi_m \phi_n \phi_p = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{mnp>0} (k_m + k_n + k_p) \, \phi_m \phi_n \phi_p. \tag{5.38}$$

These corrections are exactly of the right form and the right sign to restore equality between (5.32) and (5.33). There are four such terms, corresponding to the upper and the lower limit of the integrations over each of q' and q''. Due to the crudeness of the approximation in (5.37), the above argument is not expected to give the correct overall coefficient of the correction term. However, this coefficient can be inferred from the fact that for a finite cutoff ϵ, all integrals are well behaved and the identity (5.31) will be valid. We therefore expect the correction term to be exactly equal to the difference between (5.32) and (5.33), which is given by

$$-\frac{\pi L^3}{24} \sum_{mnp>0}{}' \, 4 \, (k_m + k_n + k_p) \, \phi_m \phi_n \phi_p.$$

Once the coefficients have been determined, we can can work backwards and

write down the *regulated* expressions

$$\begin{aligned}\int dq\,\frac{\cos k_m q \sin k_n q}{\phi_0^2}\left(\phi_0 \fint dq''\frac{\cos k_p q''}{x(q)-x(q'')}\right)\\ = -\frac{L^3}{8}\big(|k_m+k_n-k_p|+|k_m-k_n+k_p|\\ -|k_m+k_n+k_p|-|k_m-k_n-k_p|+2k_n\big)\end{aligned} \tag{5.39}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\int dq\,\frac{\cos k_m q}{\phi_0^2}\left(\phi_0 \fint dq'\frac{\cos k_n q'}{x(q)-x(q')}\right)\left(\phi_0 \fint dq''\frac{\cos k_p q''}{x(q)-x(q'')}\right)\\ = -\frac{\pi L^3}{8}\big(|k_m+k_n-k_p|+|k_m-k_n+k_p|\\ -|k_m+k_n+k_p|-|k_m-k_n-k_p|+2k_n+2k_p\big),\end{aligned} \tag{5.40}$$

where the final terms are cutoff independent corrections to the naive expressions obtained from the principal part prescription.

Using the second of these two equalities in the calculation of the expansion of (5.32), we indeed find equivalence between (5.32) and (5.33).

The first equality can be used in the calculation of the cubic part of the supercharge Q of the previous section. However, and we want to stress this point, this regulation is *inconsistent* with supersymmetry in the following sense: discarding cutoff-dependent terms first before and then after calculating $H = \frac{1}{2}\{Q, Q^\dagger\}$, one finds inequivalent expressions for H. This can be traced to cutoff dependent contributions to the quadratic part of Q combining with cutoff dependent contributions to the cubic part of $Q^\dagger$ to give finite cubic terms in H. In other words, the regularization does not commute with taking the bracket.

The interpretation of this result is not clear. It may be an indication that it is impossible to define a supersymmetric theory of which the bosonic part agrees with the bosonic collective field theory of [6]. On the other hand, the message may well be that some kind of dynamical supersymmetry breaking is at work. This is a topic that needs further investigation.

If we are willing to overlook the lack of correspondence with the bosonic collective field theory, we have the option of simply regulating the integrals according to the naive prescriptions of the previous section. The naive regularization commutes with the operation $H = \frac{1}{2}\{Q, Q^\dagger\}$, and can therefore be taken to define a supersymmetric theory.

This concludes our discussion of the harmonic theory. In the next chapter we move on to more general potentials.

6. GENERAL POTENTIAL

In the previous two chapters we discussed the potential free case $v(x) = 0$ and the harmonic case $v(x) = \omega x$. We now generalise the discussion to the case where v can be a more general polynomial in x. We will start by demonstrating supersymmetry of the quadratic spectrum at the semiclassical level. We then move on to a discussion of the criticality of the potential, which will be seen to correspond to that of $c < 1$ zero-dimensional matrix models. We conclude with a discussion of the prospects for finding a suitable scaling limit for defining a $d = 1$ superstring theory.

6.1. Semiclassical spectrum

In the previous two chapters supersymmetry of the quadratic spectrum was explicitly demonstrated in the potential free case and in the harmonic case. In this section we generalise this result to the case of an arbitrary potential $v(x)$. In particular, we show that if there exists a supersymmetric classical vacuum density, the quadratic spectrum will be supersymmetric.

Referring back to chapter 3, we note that the condition (3.8) for supersymmetry at the level of the classical vacuum can equivalently be restated as

$$W_{;x}|_{\phi_0} = 0, \tag{6.1}$$

where W stands for the effective superpotential of (2.46). When this condition is satisfied, the continuum Hamiltonian (2.11) can be expanded around ϕ_0 to give a quadratic contribution

$$H_0 = H_0^B + H_0^F, \tag{6.2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} {H_0}^B &= \frac{1}{2}\int dx\, \phi_0(x) \left(p^2 + \int dy \int dz\, W_{;xy} W_{;xz}\, \eta(y)\, \eta(z) \right), \\ {H_0}^F &= \frac{1}{2}\int dx \int dy\, \left[\psi^\dagger(x), \sqrt{\phi_0(x)}\, W_{;xy}\, \sqrt{\phi_0(y)} \psi(y) \right], \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

and where the expressions of the form $W_{;xy}$ are evaluated at ϕ_0.

Defining the change of variables $dq = dx/\phi_0$ and rescaling $p \to p/\phi_0$, $\psi \to \psi/\sqrt{\phi_0}$, $\psi^\dagger \to \psi^\dagger/\sqrt{\phi_0}$, the Hamiltonian simplifies to give

$$\begin{aligned} {H_0}^B &= \frac{1}{2}\int dq\, \left(p^2 + \left(\int dq'\, W_{;qq'}\, \eta(q')\right)^2\right), \\ {H_0}^F &= \frac{1}{2}\int dq\, \left[\psi^\dagger(q), \int dq'\, W_{;qq'}\, \psi(q')\right], \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

where we have used the identity $\delta/\delta\varphi(q) = \phi_0(q)\,\delta/\delta\varphi(x)$, which follows by the chain rule, keeping in mind the fact that $\delta(q-q') = \phi_0(q)\,\delta(x-x')$.

Now let $\tilde{W}$ be the kernel defined by

$$\tilde{W}(\phi)(q) \equiv \int dq'\, W_{;qq'}\, \phi(q'). \tag{6.5}$$

Then the quadratic Hamiltonian can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} {H_0}^B &= \frac{1}{2}\int dq\, \left(p^2 + \left(\tilde{W}(\eta)(q)\right)^2\right), \\ {H_0}^F &= \frac{1}{2}\int dq\, \left[\psi^\dagger(q), \tilde{W}(\psi)(q)\right], \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

Let $\{\phi_n\}$ be a complete set of normalised eigenfunctions of $\tilde{W}$, *i.e.*,

$$\tilde{W}\phi_n = \lambda_n \phi_n. \tag{6.7}$$

Assuming $\tilde{W}$ to be positive definite, we can expand the fields as

$$\begin{aligned} \eta &= \sum_n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\lambda_n}}\,(a_n\phi_n + a_n^\dagger\phi_n^*), \\ p &= \sum_n -i\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_n}{2}}\,(a_n\phi_n - a_n^\dagger\phi_n^*), \\ \psi &= \sum_n b_n\phi_n, \\ \psi^\dagger &= \sum_n b_n^\dagger\phi_n^*, \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

where $[a_m, a_n^\dagger] = \delta_{mn}$ and $\{b_m, b_n^\dagger\} = \delta_{mn}$, all other commutators vanishing.

It is then trivial to show that

$$\begin{aligned} {H_0}^B &= \sum_n \lambda_n (a_n^\dagger a_n + \frac{1}{2}), \\ {H_0}^F &= \sum_n \lambda_n (b_n^\dagger b_n - \frac{1}{2}), \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

thus demonstrating explicit supersymmetry of the quadratic spectrum.

It should be emphasized that the above argument is only valid in the case where there exists a supersymmetric classical configuration ϕ_0, and does not make any statement on the presence or absence of supersymmetry at the quadratic level when one expands about an extremum that is not supersymmetric.

Now, as we already noted in chapter 3, for a certain subclass of potentials $v(x)$, certain simplifications occur. To investigate this, note that the bosonic part of the quadratic piece in the perturbation expansion (3.10) of the Hamiltonian was found to be given by

$${H_0}^B = \frac{1}{2}\int dx\, \phi_0 p^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{2}\int dx\, \phi_0 (\partial_x \eta)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int dx \fint dy\, \frac{v(x)-v(y)}{x-y}\, \partial_x \eta\, \partial_y \eta. \tag{6.10}$$

When v is of the general form $v(x) = a + bx + cx^2$, the third term in this expansion falls away due to the constraint $\int dx\, \partial_x \eta = 0$, and the quadratic spectrum reduces to that of a massless scalar. Explicitly, one has in q-space

$${H_0}^B = \frac{1}{2}\int dq\, \left(p^2 + \pi^2 (\partial_q \eta)^2\right). \tag{6.11}$$

In the light of the above discussion, we already know that assuming that there exists a supersymmetric classical configuration, the fermionic spectrum will also be that of a massless scalar particle. One should therefore be able to rewrite the fermionic piece

$${H_0}^F = \frac{1}{2}\int dx\, \left[\psi^\dagger(x)\sqrt{\phi_0(x)}, \frac{d}{dx}\fint dy\, \frac{\psi(y)\sqrt{\phi_0(y)}}{x-y}\right] \tag{6.12}$$

in a form in which this property is manifest.

Assuming q to be defined on $[0, L]$, we expand η and p as

$$\begin{aligned}\eta(q) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi^2 n}} (a_n + a_n^\dagger) \sin \frac{n\pi q}{L}, \\ p(q) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} -i\sqrt{\frac{\pi^2 n}{2L^2}} (a_n - a_n^\dagger) \sin \frac{n\pi q}{L},\end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

where $[a_m, a_n^\dagger] = \delta_{mn}$. In the above Dirichlet boundary conditions have been assumed.

The bosonic part of the quadratic Hamiltonian is then simply given by

$${H_0}^B = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{n\pi^2}{L} (a_n^\dagger a_n + \frac{1}{2}). \tag{6.14}$$

In (6.6) the Hamiltonian was expressed in terms of a kernel $\tilde{W}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}{H_0}^B &= \frac{1}{2} \int dq \left(p^2 + \left(\tilde{W}(\eta)(q) \right)^2 \right), \\ {H_0}^F &= \frac{1}{2} \int dq \left[\psi^\dagger(q), \tilde{W}(\psi)(q) \right].\end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

The same kernel therefore appears in both the bosonic and the fermionic part of the Hamiltonian. Remembering that we want to rewrite the fermionic piece in a simpler form, our motivation is therefore to solve for $\tilde{W}$ by determining its properties.

Expanding with respect to a complete set of normalised Dirichlet eigenfunctions of $\tilde{W}$ on $[0, L]$, we had

$$\begin{aligned}\eta &= \sum_n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\lambda_n}} (\tilde{a}_n \phi_n + \tilde{a}_n^\dagger \phi_n^*), \\ p &= \sum_n -i\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_n}{2}} (\tilde{a}_n \phi_n - \tilde{a}_n^\dagger \phi_n^*),\end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

and

$$H_0{}^B = \sum_n \lambda_n(\tilde{a}_n^\dagger \tilde{a}_n + \frac{1}{2}). \tag{6.17}$$

Comparing (6.17) and (6.14), one immediately sees that in the present case $\tilde{W}$ has eigenvalues $\lambda_n = \pi^2 n/L$. All that remains is therefore to explicitly solve for its eigenfunctions ϕ_n.

As both (6.13) and (6.16) are expansions of the same fields in terms of normalised oscillator coordinates, it follows that the a's are unitarily related to the $\tilde{a}$'s, *i.e.*,

$$a_n = U_{ni}\tilde{a}_i, \qquad a_n^\dagger = U_{ni}^*\tilde{a}_i^\dagger, \tag{6.18}$$

where $U^\dagger U = 1$. Comparing (6.17) and (6.14) one finds

$$\sum_n \lambda_n \tilde{a}_n^\dagger \tilde{a}_n = \sum_{n\,i\,j} \lambda_n\, U_{nj}^*\, \tilde{a}_j^\dagger\, U_{ni}\, \tilde{a}_i, \tag{6.19}$$

from which it follows by comparing coefficients that $U^\dagger \Lambda U = \Lambda$, where Λ is the diagonal matrix with $\Lambda_{ii} = \lambda_i$. Using the fact that U is unitary, this is equivalent to $[U, \Lambda] = [U^\dagger, \Lambda] = 0$. Thus U leaves the eigenspaces of Λ invariant, and as the eigenvalues $\lambda_n = \pi^2 n/L$ are nondegenerate, we conclude that U is diagonal with complex phase factors on the diagonal.

Thus each a_n is related to $\tilde{a}_n$ by a phase factor. Comparing (6.13) and (6.16), it follows that the eigenfunctions of $\tilde{W}$ are given by

$$\phi_n(q) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sin\frac{\pi n q}{L}, \tag{6.20}$$

modulo an inessential phase. In other words,

$$\tilde{W} \sin\frac{\pi n q}{L} = \frac{\pi^2 n}{L} \sin\frac{\pi n q}{L}. \tag{6.21}$$

Using the identity

$$\fint dq\, \frac{e^{ikq}}{q'-q} = -\pi i\, \epsilon(k)\, e^{ikq'}, \tag{6.22}$$

it is a simple matter to verify that

$$\frac{d}{dq'} \fint dq\, \frac{\sin kq}{q'-q} = \pi\, |k|\, \sin kq', \tag{6.23}$$

so that the kernel can be written as

$$\tilde{W}(\phi)(q') = \frac{d}{dq'} \fint dq\, \frac{\phi(q)}{q'-q} \tag{6.24}$$

The conclusion is therefore that the fermionic piece of the Hamiltonian (6.6) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} {H_0}^F &= \frac{1}{2} \int dq\, \left[\psi^\dagger(q), \tilde{W}(\psi)(q)\right], \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int dq\, \left[\psi^\dagger(q), \frac{d}{dq} \fint dq'\, \frac{\psi(q')}{q-q'}\right], \end{aligned} \tag{6.25}$$

or, in terms of the "absolute" derivative, defined in section (4.4),

$${H_0}^F = \frac{-\pi i}{2} \int dq\, \left[\psi^\dagger, |\partial_q|\psi\right]. \tag{6.26}$$

This concludes the demonstration that with the above restriction on the potential $v(x)$, the quadratic Hamiltonian can be rewritten in a form manifestly that of a free Majorana fermion. On the way we have proved the identity

$$\int dq\, \psi^\dagger(q)\, \frac{d}{dq} \fint dq'\, \frac{\phi_0(q')\psi(q')}{x(q)-x(q')} = \int dq\, \psi^\dagger(q)\, \frac{d}{dq} \fint dq'\, \frac{\psi(q')}{q-q'}, \tag{6.27}$$

valid when the potential $v(x)$ is at most quadratic in x. This identity may look deceptively trivial to prove via contour integration arguments, due to the fact that $\phi_0 = x'$, so that both integrands have the same residues. However, in general the function x may have additional poles in unfavourable positions for the naive argument to be valid.

As already mentioned in chapter 3, for $v(x)$ of cubic and higher order in x, one obtains an additional nonlocal quadratic contribution given by

$$-\frac{1}{2}\int dx \fint dy\, \frac{v(x)-v(y)}{x-y}\,\partial_x\eta\,\partial_y\eta.$$

This term introduces an effective mass for the scalar boson and, by supersymmetry, also for the Majorana fermion.

6.2. Scaling limit

Ultimately we are interested in the large N behaviour of the system under consideration, a fact that was already implicit when we approximated discrete densities by continuous functions. In particular, we would like to know whether a suitable scaling limit exists and what physical interpretation to attach to it. With this in mind, we now turn to a discussion of the scaling behaviour of the potential.

Consider the bosonic part of the potential in (3.1):

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\phi) = \frac{N^2}{2}\int dx\,\phi(x)\left(\fint dy\,\frac{\phi(y)}{x-y} - v(x)\right)^2, \tag{6.28}$$

where $v(x)$ is an arbitrary polynomial. A sufficient condition for supersymmetry to be preserved to leading order in N is that there exist a classical configuration ϕ_0 such that

$$\fint dy\,\frac{\phi_0(y)}{x-y} - v(x) = 0, \tag{6.29}$$

with $\int \phi_0 = 1$. There is a well-known way of solving this equation using analytic methods [31].

Alternatively, assuming that v has been chosen in such a way as to avoid possible problems with the identity (3.4) such as occur in the free case (section

(4.1)), we can rewrite the bosonic potential in the form

$$\tilde{V}_{\rm eff}(\phi)/N^2 = \frac{\pi^2}{6}\int \phi^3 + \frac{1}{2}\int v^2\phi - \mu\left(\int \phi - 1\right) - \frac{1}{2}\int dx \fint dy\, \frac{v(x)-v(y)}{x-y}\,\phi(x)\,\phi(y), \tag{6.30}$$

where the Lagrange multiplier μ has been introduced to enforce the constraint $\int \phi = 1$. Classical vacua can be found by extremizing this potential with respect to ϕ. The condition for ϕ_0 to be an extremum of (6.30) is given by

$$\frac{\pi^2}{2}\,\phi_0^2(x) + \frac{1}{2}\,v^2(x) - \mu - \fint dy\, \frac{v(x)-v(y)}{x-y}\,\phi_0(y) = 0, \tag{6.31}$$

where μ is determined in terms of the other parameters of the theory by the above constraint.

Assuming that the vacuum configuration is supersymmetric, *i.e.*, $V_{\rm eff}(\phi_0) = 0$, the Lagrange multiplier will be zero. This is a simple consequence of the fact that in such a case ϕ_0 is an genuine minimum of the (positive definite) potential $V_{\rm eff}$ rather than just a minimum of $V_{\rm eff}$ relative to the constraint. To see this more clearly, note that the condition of stationarity with respect to variations in ϕ, given by

$$\delta_\phi \tilde{V}_{\rm eff} = \delta_\phi V_{\rm eff} - \mu = 0, \tag{6.32}$$

implies that $\mu = 0$ when $\delta V_{\rm eff} = 0$, which will indeed be the case at ϕ_0 satisfying $V_{\rm eff}(\phi_0) = 0$. Conversely, if $\mu \neq 0$ then $V_{\rm eff}(\phi_0) \neq 0$, and supersymmetry is broken. The stationarity condition (6.31) is therefore more general than the condition (6.29) in that (6.31) may allow us to find extrema that are not supersymmetric, *i.e.*, such that $V_{\rm eff}(\phi_0) \neq 0$, in which case we may in general have $\mu \neq 0$. In other words, while (6.29) is sufficient for stationarity, the second condition (6.31) is necessary and sufficient.

When the classical vacuum configuration is supersymmetric then, even though the Lagrange multiplier $\mu = 0$, the last term in (6.31) may generate an effective chemical potential, an example of which we saw in the harmonic case (see equation (5.11) and the subsequent remarks).

It is at present unclear what the spacetime interpretation of the one-dimensional supersymmetric matrix model should be. In the $d = 1$ matrix model formulation of the $c = 1$ bosonic string, an extra dimension is dynamically generated [2] to give an effective two-dimensional theory, the extra dimension being associated to the Liouville degree of freedom. The essential ingredient in the derivation is the existence of a double scaling limit in which the turning point of the vacuum configuration appoaches a maximum of the potential, in the vicinity of which the potential behaves as $-x^2$. As the maximum is approached, the "time of flight" becomes infinite, hence the extra dimension.

Let us now consider the scaling behaviour of the supersymmetric theory. We start by noting that equation (6.29) or (6.31) (for $\mu = 0$) defining a supersymmetric vacuum configuration is identical to that found in zero-dimensional matrix models with potential $w(x)$ such that $v = w'$ [31], as also noted in [32]. This should not be surprising, as the original motivation for the introduction of the Marinari-Parisi supersymmetric matrix model was to stabilize the critical behaviour of $d = 0$ matrix models having unbounded potentials.

In the double scaling limit these $d = 0$ models are known to describe two-dimensional quantum gravity coupled to nonunitary minimal matter of central charge $c < 1$, the value of c depending on the order of multicriticality, *i.e.*, the details of the behaviour of the effective potential as one approaches the critical point. This is in contrast to the bosonic case, where the generation of the extra dimension is related to the fact that the scaling of the potential corresponded to $c = 1$, and we therefore expect the spacetime interpretation of the supersymmetric matrix model not to be as neat as in the bosonic case.

To illustate the difference between the bosonic and the fermionic scalings, consider first the bosonic analogue of the stationarity condition (6.31). It is given by

$$\frac{\pi^2}{2}\,\phi_0^2(x) + w(x) - \mu = 0, \tag{6.33}$$

with the constraint $\int \phi_0 = 1$. The bosonic potential w is in general chosen to

depend on a coupling constant g in such a way that $w(x/\sqrt{g}) = \tilde{w}(x)/g$, where the rescaled potential $\tilde{w}$ has no explicit dependence on g. Rescaling $x \to x/\sqrt{g}$, $\phi \to \phi/\sqrt{g}$ and $\mu \to \mu/g$, all explicit dependence on g scales out of the stationarity condition, which becomes

$$\frac{\pi^2}{2}\,\phi_0^2(x) + \tilde{w}(x) - \mu = 0, \tag{6.34}$$

while the constraint becomes $\int \phi_0 = g$. We see that by changing the coupling constant g, which now appears in the normalization condition, we can freely adjust the fermi level μ with respect to the rescaled potential $\tilde{w}$. In particular, as μ approaches a $-x^2$ maximum, the time of flight $L \propto \int dx/\phi_0$ becomes infinite.

Let us now try to duplicate this in the fermionic case. Taking the potential in (6.31) to have the general scaling $v(g^a x) = g^b \tilde{v}(x)$, where $\tilde{v}$ is independent of g, and rescaling $x \to g^a x$, $\phi \to g^c \phi$ and $\mu \to g^{2c}\mu$, the stationarity condition (6.31) becomes

$$g^{2c}\,\frac{\pi^2}{2}\,\phi_0^2(x) + g^{2b}\,\frac{1}{2}\,\tilde{v}^2(x) - g^{2c}\mu - g^{b+c}\fint dy\,\frac{\tilde{v}(x) - \tilde{v}(y)}{x-y}\,\phi_0(y) = 0, \tag{6.35}$$

while the constraint becomes $\int \phi_0 = g^{-a-c}$. Expanding $\tilde{v}$ about x and using this constraint, the stationarity condition becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = {} & g^{2c}\,\frac{\pi^2}{2}\,\phi_0^2(x) + g^{2b}\,\frac{1}{2}\,\tilde{v}^2(x) - g^{2c}\mu \\ & - g^{b+c-a-c}\,\tilde{v}'(x) + \frac{1}{2}\,g^{b+c-a-c}\,\tilde{v}''(x)\,x - \frac{1}{2}\,g^{b+c}\,\tilde{v}''(x)\int dy\,y\,\phi_0(y) \\ & + \ldots. \end{aligned} \tag{6.36}$$

We see that if we choose $a = -b = -c$, an overall factor g^{b+c} divides out of the equation and we find

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = {} & \frac{\pi^2}{2}\,\phi_0^2(x) + \frac{1}{2}\,\tilde{v}^2(x) - \mu \\ & - \tilde{v}'(x) + \frac{1}{2}\;\tilde{v}''(x)\,x - \frac{1}{2}\,\tilde{v}''(x)\int dy\,y\,\phi_0(y) \\ & + \ldots, \end{aligned} \tag{6.37}$$

while the constraint is given by $\int \phi_0 = g^{-a-c} = 1$. We have thus succeeded in getting rid of all explicit and implicit dependence of ϕ_0 on g. Rewriting this we therefore get

$$\frac{\pi^2}{2}\,\phi_0^2(x) + \frac{1}{2}\,\tilde{v}^2(x) - \mu - \fint dy\,\frac{\tilde{v}(x) - \tilde{v}(y)}{x-y}\,\phi_0(y) = 0, \tag{6.38}$$

with the constraint $\int \phi_0 = 1$. A point we want to emphasize is that in contrast to the bosonic case the parameter g does not appear in the constraint, so that the effective fermi level is not a free parameter relative to the rescaled effective potential in (6.38) and cannot be adjusted to approach a maximum. (The effective fermi level here is given by μ plus any x-independent terms arising from the cross term in (6.38)). The time of flight, given by $L \propto \int dx/\phi_0$, remains finite and no true extra dimension is generated.

The above argument assumes that $v(x)$ depends in a particularly simple way on only one parameter g, and does not make a statement on the possibility or not of reproducing an analogue of the bosonic scaling limit when this is not the case. This seems very hard to do in specific examples that have been considered (not reproduced here), but more work needs to be done to gain a better understanding of this issue.

In conclusion, the scaling behaviour of the supersymmetric theory, when expanded about a classical vacuum, corresponds to that of $d = 0$ matrix models. This is in contrast to the bosonic collective field theory and no true extra dimension is generated in the scaling limit.

In view of this fact, and also considering the argument of section (4.5), where it was shown that the turning point regularizations of three point functions that have been used in the bosonic collective field theory are incompatible with supersymmetry, the true structure of any $d = 1$ supersymmetric string theory remains very much a mystery.

One clue towards finding the correct structure of such a theory may be the fact that in the bosonic $d = 1$ string a W-algebra structure arises naturally [4, 5] —

the idea would therefore be to investigate theories that naturally fit into suitable supersymmetric generalizations of the W-algebra [35]. This issue is currently under investigation.

7. CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis an investigation was made of the super-Calogero model with particular emphasis on its continuum formulation and possible application in the context of supersymmetrizing the bosonic collective $d = 1$ string field theory.

We started with a discussion of the model both in a discrete and continuum formulation, demonstrating its equivalence with the Jevicki-Rodrigues supersymmetrized collective field theory and the Marinari-Parisi supersymmetric matrix model. Upon quantization, the continuum fields were found to have nontrivial commutation relations involving square roots of the density field, which led to an infinite sequence of higher order vertices in the perturbative Hamiltonian as well as the supersymmetry generators. This was in contrast to the bosonic collective field theory, where only a cubic vertex is required.

We then discussed the potential free case, with an explicit calculation of the spectrum and the cubic vertices, in the process identifying the superpartner of the masless tachyon to be a massless Majorana fermion. We compared a particular spacetime formulation of the theory with gauge fixed two-dimensional supergravity and found that the comparison breaks down because of nonlocal terms in the interactions. The exact spectrum, as previously obtained in the bosonic collective field theory, was generalised to the supersymmetric case and a concise representation of the superpartners of the bosonic eigenstates was obtained. In addition to this, a formulation was postulated in which to investigate nonperturbative effects such as solitons in a semiclassical analysis.

For the harmonic case, the semiclassical spectrum was obtained and found to be similar to that of the free case. The cubic vertices were then calculated, an undertaking that turned out to be very sensitive to the method of regularization. If one wants to preserve supersymmetry, it seems that one cannot generate a bosonic sector compatible with the bosonic collective field theory (no $a_m a_n a_p$ terms).

We then moved on to more general potentials, first showing that the semiclassical spectrum is always supersymmetric provided one expands around a super-

symmetric classical configuration. For a specific class of superpotentials we then demonstrated that the semiclassical spectrum is that of a massless scalar boson and a massless Majorana fermion, the quadratic terms taking a particularly simple form in terms of the scaling coordinates.

We concluded with a discussion of the scaling properties of the superpotentials and the possibility of a spacetime interpretation of the double scaled theory. It was argued that the scaling poperties of the classical vacuum density correspond to that found in zero-dimensional $c < 1$ models, where no true extra dimension is created. This is in contrast to the bosonic case; thus the spacetime interpretation remains problematic and more work is needed on this issue.

At this point various directions of study may be pursued. On the one hand, in view of the fact that in the bosonic case a W-algebra structure has been identified [4, 5], one can attempt to associate to the above theory a suitable supersymmetric generalization of the W-algebra [35]. One could also start from the opposite direction: the true theory of $d = 1$ superstrings may not correspond to the model described in this thesis, in which case one may find clues to the correct description directly from the structure of suitable supersymmetric extensions of the W-algebra. Finally, there is a lot to be done to extend existing results for the discrete Calogero model [34] to its supersymmetric generalization.

REFERENCES

1. A. Jevicki and B. Sakita, *Nucl. Phys.* **B165** (1980) 511.
2. S.R. Das and A. Jevicki, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A5** (1990) 1639.
3. J. Polchinski, *Nucl. Phys.* **B346** (1990) 253.
4. J. Avan and A. Jevicki, Brown University preprints, BROWN-HET-801 (1991), BROWN-HET-824 (1991) and BROWN-HET-839 (1991);
5. J. Polchinski, University of Texas preprint UTTG-06-91 (1991); D. Minic, J. Polchinski and Z. Yang, University of Texas preprint UTTG-16-91; E. Witten, "Ground ring of two dimensional string theory", IASSNS-HEP-91/51 (1991), to appear in *Nucl. Phys. B.*; E. Witten and B. Zwiebach, "Algebraic structures and differential geometry in 2d string theory", SLAC-PUB-IASSNS-HEP-92/4, MIT-CTP-2057 (1992).
6. K. Demeterfi, A. Jevicki and J.P. Rodrigues, *Nucl. Phys.* **B362** (1991) 173; K. Demeterfi, A. Jevicki and J.P. Rodrigues, *Nucl. Phys.* **B365** (1991) 499.
7. K. Demeterfi, A. Jevicki and J.P. Rodrigues, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A6** (1991) 3199.
8. D. J. Gross and N. Miljkovic, *Phys. Lett.* **B238** (1990) 217; E. Brézin, V. A. Kazakov and Al. B. Zamolodchikov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B338** (1990) 673; P. Ginsparg and J. Zinn-Justin, *Phys. Lett.* **B240** (1990) 333.
9. P. Di Francesco and D. Kutasov, *Phys. Lett.* **B261** (1991) 385; N. Sakai and Y. Tanii, Tokyo Inst. of Technology preprint TIT/HEP-1684; Y. Kitazawa, Harvard preprint HUTP-91/A034 (1991); M. Bershadsky and I. R. Klebanov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** (1990) 3088; Princeton preprint PUPT-1197 (1990);
10. D. J. Gross and I. R. Klebanov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B352** (1991) 671, *B356* (1991) 3; A. Sengupta and S. Wadia, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A6** (1991) 1961.
11. G. Moore, Rutgers and Yale preprint RU-91-12 and YCTP-P8-91 (1991).

12. D. Kutasov and N. Seiberg, *Phys. Lett.* **B251** (1990) 67.

13. J. Alfaro and P. H. Damgaard, *Phys. Lett.* **B222** (1989) 425; E. Marinari and G. Parisi, *Phys. Lett.* **B240** (1990) 375; M. Karliner and A. A. Migdal, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A6** (1990) 2565; S. Belluci, T.R. Govindrajan, A. Kumar and R. N. Oerter, *Phys. Lett.* **B249** (1990) 49; J. Gonzalez, *Phys. Lett.* **B255** (1991) 367; L. Alvarez-Gaume' and J. L. Manes, CERN preprint CERN-TH-6067/91; A. Dabholkar, Rutgers University preprint RU-91-20 (1991).

14. E. Abdalla, M.C.B. Abdalla and D. Dalmazi, K. Haradi, "Correlation functions in super Liouville theory", São Paolo preprint (1991); K. Aoki and E. d'Hoker, "Correlation functions of minimal models coupled to two dimensional quantum supergravity", UCLA preprint UCLA/91/TEP/33 (1991); L. Alvarez-Gaume' and P. Zaugg, "Some correlation functions of minimal superconformal models coupled to supergravity", CERN preprint CERN-TH.6243/91 (1991).

15. P. Di Francesco and D. Kutasov, Princeton University preprint PUPT-1276 (1991); P. Bouwknegt, J. McCarthy and K. Pilch, "Ground ring for the 2d NSR string", CERN preprint CERN-TH.6346/91 (1991), to appear in *Commun. Math. Phys*; K. Itoh and N. Ohta, "Spectrum of two-dimensional (super)gravity", Osaka University and Brown University preprints OS-GE 22-91, BROWN-HET-844.

16. A. Jevicki and J.P. Rodrigues, *Phys. Lett.* **B268** (1991) 53.

17. A. Jevicki, "Nonperturbative collective field theory", Brown University preprint BROWN-HET-807 (1991).

18. E. Brézin, C. Itzykson, G. Parisi and J.B. Zuber, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **59**, 35-51 (1978).

19. J.P. Rodrigues, *Phys. Rev.* **D26** (1982) 2833.

20. M. Casartelli, G. Marchesini and E. Onofri, *J. Phys.* **A13** (1980) 1217.

21. A. Jevicki and H. Levine, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44** (1980) 1443.

22. R. Calogero, *J. Math. Phys.* **12** (1971) 419.

23. D.Z. Freedman and P.F. Mende, *Nucl. Phys.* **B344** (1990) 317.

24. I.R. Klebanov and A.M. Polyakov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **35A** (1991) 3273.

25. M.B. Green, J.H. Schwarz and E. Witten, "Superstring Theory", Volume I, Cambridge University Press (1987).

26. P.A.M. Dirac, "Lectures on Quantum Mechanics", Yeshiva University press (1964).

27. F.A. Berezin, "The Method of Second Quantization", Academic Press (1966).

28. A. D'Adda, "Comments on supersymmetric vector and matrix models", Turin University preprint DFTT 24/91 (1991); L. Alvarez-Gaumé and J.L. Mañes, "Supermatrix models", CERN preprint CERN-TH.6067/91 (1991).

29. E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B185** (1981) 513, *Nucl. Phys.* **B202** (1982) 253; P. Salomonson and J.W. van Holten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B196** (1982) 509; D. Lancaster, *Nuovo Cim.* **79A** (1984) 28.

30. I. Bars, *J. Math. Phys.* **21** (1980) 2678; T. Maekawa, *J. Math. Phys.* **26** (1985) 1902.

31. D.J. Gross and A.A. Migdal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** (1990) 127; M.R. Douglas and S. Shenker, *Nucl. Phys.* **B335** (1990) 635; E. Brézin and V. Kazakov, *Phys. Lett.* **B236** (1990) 144; C. Crnković, P. Ginsparg and G. Moore, *Phys. Lett.* **B237** (1990); D.J. Gross and A. Migdal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** (1990) 717; E. Brézin, M.R. Douglas, V.A. Kazakov and S.H. Shenker, *Phys. Lett.* **B237** (1990) 43; M. Douglas, *Phys. Lett.* **238B** (1990) 176; K. Demeterfi, N. Deo, S. Jain and Chung-I Tan, *Phys. Rev.* **D42** (1990) 4105.

32. J. Feinberg, "String field theory for $d \leq 0$ matrix models via Marinari-Parisi", Israel Inst. of Technology preprint TECHNION-PH-92-1 (1992); J.D. Cohn and H. Dykstra, "The Marinari-Parisi model and collective field theory", Fermilab preprint FERMILAB-PUB-92/35-T (1992).

33. B. Sazdović, private communication.

34. F. Calogero, *J. Math. Phys.* **10** (1969) 2191, *J. Math. Phys.* **10** (1969) 2197, *J. Math. Phys.* **12** (1971) 419, *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **19** (1977) 505, *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **20** (1977) 251; A.M. Perelomov, *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* **12** (1971) 364, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré* **28** (1978) 407; M.A. Olshanetsky and A.M. Perelomov, *Phys. Rep.* **71** (1981) 313, *Phys. Rep.* **94** (1983) 313; M. Bruschi and F. Calogero, *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **24** (1879) 601; S. Ahmed, M. Bruschi, F. Calogero, M. Olshanetsky and A.M. Perelomov, *Nuovo Cim.* **B49** (1979) 173.

35. E. Bergshoeff, B. de Wit and M. Vasiliev, "The structure of the super-W_∞ algebra", CERN preprint CERN-TH.6021/91; E. Bergshoeff, C.N. Pope, L.J. Romans, E. Sezgin and X. Shen, *Phys. Lett.* **B245** (1990) 447; T. Inami, Y. Matsuo and I. Yamanaka, *Phys. Lett.* **B215** (1988) 701; F. Yu, "The super-KP origin of the super-$W_{1+\infty}$ algebra and its topological version", Utah University preprint UU-HEP-91/12 (1991).

36. B. Zwiebach, *Ann. Phys.* **186** (1988) 111.

37. J. Cohn and S.P. DeAlwis, IAS preprint IASSNS-HEP-91/7 (1991).